



Facultad de Psicología
Departamento de Psicología Básica

COMPRENSIÓN HISTÓRICA Y CONSTRUCCIÓN DE LA IDENTIDAD NACIONAL EN LA REPRESENTACIÓN DE LAS NARRATIVAS MAESTRAS

HISTORY UNDERSTANDING AND NATIONAL IDENTITY CONSTRUCTION IN
MASTER NARRATIVE REPRESENTATION

Tesis Doctoral

Madrid, Marzo 2015

Autor: Floor van Alphen

Director: Mario Carretero

La realización de esta Tesis Doctoral ha sido posible gracias a una beca de doctorado del Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas (CONICET), Argentina.

Además esta Tesis se enmarca dentro de los siguientes proyectos de investigación dirigidos por Mario Carretero:

Representación de narrativas históricas en distintos entornos culturales, financiado por el Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación España (EDU-2013-42531)

Enseñanza de la historia y concepciones sobre la nación en alumnos de España e Iberoamérica, financiado por el Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación España (EDU-2010 17725)

Representación y cambio de las concepciones y narrativas históricas sobre la Nación (PICT 2012-1594), financiado por la Agencia Nacional de Promoción Científica y Tecnológica (ANPCyT), Ministerio de Ciencia Tecnología e Innovación Productiva (MINCyT) de la Argentina.

Comprensión de conceptos históricos y sociales y construcción de la identidad nacional en adolescentes y jóvenes (PICT-2008-1217), financiado por la Agencia Nacional de Promoción Científica y Tecnológica (ANPCyT), Ministerio de Ciencia Tecnología e Innovación Productiva (MINCyT) de la Argentina.

Estoy muy agradecida por todo el apoyo.

AGRADECIMIENTOS

Ésta Tesis Doctoral no hubiera sido posible sin el trabajo y la ayuda de muchos colegas y amigos. Al convertirse en un proyecto tanto internacional como interdisciplinario mi gratitud se extiende de un lado del Atlántico al otro y, de la psicología a la Historia. Los esfuerzos en los campos de la historiografía, la psicología cultural, los estudios en la enseñanza de la Historia, la memoria colectiva y, el aprendizaje de la historia, han contribuido enormemente a la realización de este trabajo.

He sido privilegiada en trabajar con mi director de Tesis, Mario Carretero. En una sola frase diría que ha sido el anfitrión perfecto. Me dio la bienvenida a un entorno interdisciplinar estimulante, a cenas informales, animadas discusiones y, una gran variedad de conferencias internacionales. En particular he disfrutado de maravillarnos juntos sobre muchas diferentes temas relacionadas a la Tesis, relevantes dentro y fuera de la academia, en Argentina, España, los Países Bajos y tantos lugares más. Espero que podamos continuar nuestra colaboración en proyectos en el futuro.

En segundo lugar agradezco mis colegas de equipo, profesores e investigadores tanto en FLACSO Argentina como en la Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, por la ayuda e inspiración que me dieron. Trabajar con César López, Alicia Barreiro, María Sarti, José Antonio Castorina, Mikel Asensio, Elena Asenjo y Cristian Parellada ha facilitado y contribuido mucho a la elaboración de la Tesis. Agradezco especialmente a Soledad Sanseau y Fernando Adrover que me hicieron sentir como en casa durante estos años en Buenos Aires.

También agradezco a los profesores e investigadores Ana María Talak (Universidad Nacional de La Plata), Luciano Nicolás García (Universidad de Buenos Aires), René van de Veer (Universiteit Leiden) y Jaan Valsiner (Aalborg University). Con o sin saberlo ellos han sido partes de la cadena genealógica que me ha llevado a realizar éste proyecto internacional e interdisciplinario. Y además, muchas gracias a todos los colegas, profesores e investigadores, y los amigos inspirándome, o ‘distrayéndome’ como uno de ellos diría, en estos años: Héctor García de Frutos (Universitat de Barcelona), Lúcia Falcão (Universidade Federal Rural de Pernambuco), Arthur Leal Ferreira (Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro), Ezequiel diPaolo (ikerbasque), Hanne de Jaegher (Universidad del País Vasco), Michael Bamberg (Clark University), Nacho Montero (Universidad Autónoma de Madrid) y Florentino Blanco (Universidad Autónoma de Madrid).

Por último, ningún proyecto se ha realizado jamás sin el amor y la paciencia de amigos y familia. En este sentido soy afortunada al tenerlos tanto en los Países Bajos como en Argentina. Han contribuido a mis múltiples y dinámicas identificaciones. Si sólo esto significaría poder estar en los dos lados al mismo tiempo.

RESUMEN

La imaginación de la nación se ha considerado, cada vez más de manera interdisciplinaria, como un proceso histórico, social, educativo y psicológico. En el contexto de ésta Tesis Doctoral se estudiará, desde el punto de vista psicológico cognitivo, cómo se produce la representación de la nación, en cuanto categoría histórica. De hecho, la nación apenas se puede imaginar si no fuera por los relatos históricos que la constituyen. Al tratarse de la enseñanza de la Historia nacional se puede observar una tensión entre la comprensión histórica disciplinaria de la nación, por un lado, y, a la construcción de la identidad nacional, por otro. Para considerar cómo ésta tensión, enmarca la representación individual del pasado nacional, a través de la enseñanza de la Historia formal e informal, la historiografía y la memoria colectiva, se precisa un marco teórico interdisciplinar e integrado. En este sentido, la psicología sociocultural ofrece la teoría de acción mediada, en la cual un agente individual utiliza herramientas culturales colectivamente producidas. Esto permite enfocarse en los grandes relatos nacionales como mediadores en la construcción individual del pasado y, al mismo tiempo, integrar los diferentes puntos de vista académicos sobre la imaginación de la nación. Particularmente el estudio detallado de estas ‘narrativas maestras’ y su apropiación, por parte de estudiantes y adultos, puede hacer una contribución importante al preguntarse cómo se relacionan la comprensión histórica y la construcción de identidades.

Por lo tanto, ésta Tesis Doctoral versa sobre la representación de las narrativas maestras, situadas en la tensión entre la comprensión disciplinar de la Historia nacional y la construcción de la identidad nacional, por los ‘consumidores’ individuales de estas herramientas culturales. La ‘producción’ de la representación del pasado nacional se considerará en relación al agente individual que, según el marco teórico sociocultural, se apropia de ésta herramienta narrativa colectiva. La historiografía nacionalista que provee los primeros grandes relatos nacionales y, la enseñanza de la Historia que los disemina, en pos de construir identidades nacionales, han sido cruciales en términos de ésta ‘producción’.

Las publicaciones que constituyen a éste trabajo discuten y contribuyen a un modelo detallado de la producción y la consumición de las narrativas maestras. La contribución principal es la investigación detallada de la representación según la narrativa maestra, de estudiantes de secundaria en Argentina, presentada en el primer capítulo. Concretamente se han examinado 38 estudiantes de 13 y 16 años, alumnos de un colegio público de Buenos Aires, cuyas características sociales y culturales pertenecen a la clase media, mediante entrevistas

cualitativas. Dichas entrevistas se han analizado siguiendo un esquema detallado de cuatro dimensiones narrativas. El estudio demuestra que la narrativa maestra, el mito de origen de Argentina, predomina en la representación de los estudiantes de los eventos históricos nacionales. Este estudio empírico también indica posibles cambios en sus representaciones, cuando se comparan los estudiantes de 13 años con los de 16, hacia la comprensión histórica disciplinar de la nación. La nación puede ser entendida como sociohistóricamente construida, sin embargo, la comprensión de los actores y eventos históricos se ve limitada por la narrativa maestra. Por su parte el capítulo 2, toma parte de las entrevistas anteriores para llevar a cabo un análisis teórico adicional y sugerir tres diferentes construcciones que pretenden dar cuenta de cómo los estudiantes se representan la relación entre pasado y presente nacional, en su proceso de apropiación de la narrativa maestra. Dichas construcciones son: la identificación entre pasado y presente, la idealización del pasado y, la interpretación teleológica de ésta relación. Todo ello se suma al argumento de que la narrativa maestra es una herramienta cultural que restringe la comprensión histórica y posibilita la construcción de la identidad nacional.

En los capítulos 3, 4 y 5 se profundiza en la reflexión sobre la tensión entre la comprensión disciplinaria de la Historia y construcción de identidad y, el papel de la narrativa maestra. En primer lugar se discutirá la historicidad y dinámica de la noción de identidad, que de manera similar al concepto de ‘nación’ se generó históricamente (cap. 3). También se discutirá el papel de la Historia y memoria nacional frente a una historiografía más amplia y múltiples memorias colectivas (cap. 5) al reflexionar sobre cómo se podría integrar la comprensión histórica y la construcción de la identidad en la enseñanza de la Historia (cap. 4). Se sostiene que una consideración de la historicidad tanto de la identidad nacional como categoría social, como de la narrativa maestra y del concepto de nación, podría facilitar una comprensión disciplinar de la Historia nacional. Simultáneamente se defiende que la construcción de identidades se puede entender de una manera más dinámica e inclusiva y que, en este sentido, la comparación de memorias colectivas puede contribuir a una comprensión histórica más inclusiva, más allá de una narrativa nacional uniforme.

El conjunto de éstas publicaciones propone la importancia de la narrativa maestra considerada como una unidad de análisis en pos de estudiar el proceso de imaginación de la nación porque permite una consideración detallada de su representación, a través de dicha narrativa, y, una reflexión crítica de cómo la misma limita una comprensión adecuada del pasado y al mismo tiempo posibilita la identificación colectiva, la cual sin duda es relevante para el futuro de cualquier sociedad.

ABSTRACT

The imagination of nation has been considered, in an increasingly interdisciplinary way, as a historical, social, educational and psychological process. In the context of this dissertation it will be studied from a cognitive psychological point of view, in terms of how the representation of nation, as a historical category, is produced. Indeed, nation can hardly be imagined if it weren't for the historical accounts constituting it. When it comes to national history education a tension can be observed between an emphasis on a disciplinary understanding of nation and on the construction of national identities. To consider how this tension, through formal and informal history education, historiography and collective memory, frames the individual representation of the national past, an integrative approach is needed. In this sense, sociocultural psychology offers a theory of mediated action, in which the active individual or agent uses or appropriates collectively produced cultural tools. It allows focusing on grand narratives of nation as tools in the individual construction of accounts about the past, and at the same time brings together different academic views on the imagination of nation. Particularly, studying these master narratives and their appropriation by students and adults in detail can make a valuable contribution when wondering about how disciplinary historical understanding and the construction of identities relate to each other.

This dissertation is therefore mainly concerned with master narrative representation as situated in the tension between historical understanding and national identity construction, on the level of individual 'consumption' or employment of narrative tools. The 'production' of representations of the national past is considered, following the sociocultural framework of mediated action, in relation to the individual agent's appropriation of the collective narrative tool. Historiography providing the first narratives of nation and history education disseminating these narratives, as to construct national identities, are considered crucial in this respect.

The publications that constitute this dissertation will discuss and contribute to a detailed model of master narrative production and consumption. The most important contributions lie in the detailed investigation of master narrative representation in Argentine high school students, presented in chapter 1. Concretely, qualitative interviews were conducted with 38 thirteen and sixteen year old students from a public school in Buenos Aires, representing the urban middle class. These interviews were analyzed following a detailed scheme of four narrative dimensions. This investigation demonstrates the pervasiveness of the master narrative, or myth of origin, in how the students represent a fundamental part of national history. But it also indicates possible

changes in their representation, comparing the 13 and 16 year old students, towards a disciplinary historical understanding of the nation. The students who are aware of the nation as sociohistorically constructed nevertheless sustain a master narrative of national identity, limiting their historical understanding of historical actors and events. Chapter 2 is a further theoretical analysis based on part of these interviews, and suggests that there are three different ways of constructing the relation between national past and present in the students' master narrative appropriation. These are the identification between national past and present, the idealization of the national past and the teleological interpretation of this relation. This gives additional reason to consider the master narrative as a cultural tool constraining historical understanding and enabling national identity construction.

In chapters 3, 4 and 5 the tension between disciplinary historical understanding and identity construction, and the role of the master narrative, will be further reflected on. This involves discussing the historicity and dynamics of the notion of identity, that much in the same way as the concept of 'nation' has historically come into being (chapter 3). It also involves discussing national history and memory in confrontation with a wider historiography and multiple collective memories (chapter 5) while reflecting on how to integrate historical understanding and identity construction in national history education (chapter 4). It will be argued that considering the historicity of the social category of national identity, as well as the historicity of the master narrative and the nation concept, might pave the way to a more historical understanding of national history. Meanwhile, it will be defended that the construction of identities can be understood in a more dynamic and inclusive way and that in this vein the comparison of collective memories can be an important contribution to a more inclusive historical understanding, beyond a uniform nationalist narrative.

All these publications together propose the importance of considering the master narrative as an interdisciplinary unit of analysis in studying the imagination of nation, because it allows for a detailed investigation of master narrative representation. And they provide a critical account of how this representation limits the adequate comprehension of the past and whether it enables the collective identification that is relevant for the future of any society.

CONTENIDOS

	P.
AGRADECIMIENTOS	iv
RESUMEN	vi
ABSTRACT	viii
CONTENIDOS	x
 INTRODUCCIÓN	 2
LA NACIÓN Y LA HISTORIOGRAFÍA	4
LA NACIÓN Y LA ENSEÑANZA DE LA HISTORIA	6
NACIÓN, NARRATIVA Y MEMORIA COLECTIVA	10
LA NACIÓN Y EL APRENDIZAJE DE LA HISTORIA	12
UN ACERCAMIENTO A LA 'NARRATIVA MAESTRA' HISTÓRICA NACIONAL	17
IMAGINANDO A LA ARGENTINA	23
 OBJETIVOS PRINCIPALES	 28
 CAPÍTULO 1. DO MASTER NARRATIVES CHANGE AMONG HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS? A CHARACTERIZATION OF HOW NATIONAL HISTORY IS REPRESENTED	 31
NATIONAL HISTORICAL NARRATIVES AS A CULTURAL TOOL IN EDUCATION	32
NATIONAL HISTORICAL NARRATIVES AS A CULTURAL TOOL IN LEARNING HISTORY	33
A MYTH OF ORIGIN UNDER HISTORICAL SCRUTINY	36
OBJECTIVES	38
METHOD	38
<i>PARTICIPANTS</i>	38
<i>PROCEDURE</i>	39
<i>ANALYTIC STRATEGY</i>	40
RESULTS	42
<i>THE HISTORICAL SUBJECT: HOMOGENEOUS OR HETEROGENEOUS?</i>	42
<i>IDENTIFICATION</i>	44
<i>THE HISTORICAL EVENTS: SIMPLE OR COMPLEX?</i>	45
<i>THE NATION: ESSENTIAL OR CONSTRUCTED?</i>	47
<i>NARRATIVE PATTERNS</i>	49
DISCUSSION	52
 CAPÍTULO 2. THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE RELATION BETWEEN NATIONAL PAST AND PRESENT IN THE APPROPRIATION OF HISTORICAL MASTER NARRATIVES	 57
INTRODUCTION	57
THREE CONSTRUCTIONS RELATING PAST AND PRESENT IN STUDENTS' MASTER NARRATIVES	62
<i>PARTICIPANTS</i>	62
<i>PROCEDURE</i>	63
<i>ANALYTIC STRATEGY</i>	63
<i>IDENTIFYING PAST AND PRESENT</i>	64
<i>IDEALIZING THE PAST</i>	65
<i>A TELEOLOGICAL INTERPRETATION OF THE PAST</i>	66

PAST AND PRESENT IN PRESIDENTIAL MASTER NARRATIVE APPROPRIATION	68
DISCUSSION	71
CAPÍTULO 3. IDENTITIES: NEVER THE SAME AGAIN?	75
THE GENEALOGY OF (A PARTICULAR) IDENTITY	76
DYNAMIC IDENTITY	78
ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES	79
CAPÍTULO 4. THE COMPLEX CONSTRUCTION OF IDENTITY REPRESENTATIONS AND THE FUTURE OF HISTORY EDUCATION	83
IDEAS REGARDING THE PERCEIVED CONSTRUCTION OF SOCIAL REPRESENTATIONS OF HISTORICAL KNOWLEDGE OF IDENTITY	84
INTUITIVE FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE THE CONSTRUCTION OF IDENTITY	86
THE CONSTRUCTION OF IDENTITY AS A PROCESS OF RE-INTERPRETING THE FUTURE	87
COMPLICATIONS FOR HISTORY EDUCATION	88
CAPÍTULO 5. HISTORY, COLLECTIVE MEMORIES OR NATIONAL MEMORIES? HOW THE REPRESENTATION OF THE PAST IS FRAMED BY MASTER NARRATIVES	95
MEMORY AND HISTORY AS REPRESENTATIONS OF THE PAST	95
WHAT FRAMES DIFFERENT COLLECTIVE MEMORIES OF THE SAME PAST?	98
THE ROLE OF HISTORY EDUCATION IN FRAMING THE PAST	101
MASTER NARRATIVES AND THE REPRESENTATION OF THE PAST	104
MASTER NARRATIVES IN (RE-EN)ACTION	109
CONCLUSION	111
DISCUSIÓN	114
REPRESENTANDO LA NARRATIVA MAESTRA	114
LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE LA IDENTIDAD NACIONAL	121
¿UN FUTURO PARA LA ENSEÑANZA DE LA HISTORIA?	127
HACIA UNA COMPRENSIÓN INCLUSIVA DE LA HISTORIA	129
REFERENCIAS	134
LISTA DE TABLAS	
1. CRITERIA FOR NARRATIVE CHARACTERIZATION	41
2. HISTORICAL SUBJECT OF THE NARRATIVE PER GRADE LEVEL	43
3. IDENTIFICATION IN THE NARRATIVE PER GRADE LEVEL	44
4. HISTORICAL EVENTS OF THE NARRATIVE PER GRADE LEVEL	45
5. NATION CONCEPT IN THE NARRATIVE PER GRADE LEVEL	48
6. NARRATIVE PATTERNS	50
LISTA DE FIGURAS	
1. MEXICAN STUDENTS OF EDUCATION IN A MEETING ABOUT CIVIL RIGHTS	99
2. DESTRUCTION OF A LENIN STATUE IN THE UKRAINE	100

COMPRENSIÓN HISTÓRICA Y CONSTRUCCIÓN DE LA
IDENTIDAD NACIONAL EN LA REPRESENTACIÓN DE
LAS NARRATIVAS MAESTRAS

INTRODUCCIÓN

¿Cómo imaginan las personas a una nación? Esta es una pregunta en la cual muchos investigadores de diferentes disciplinas se han interesado cada vez más, sobre todo porque los procesos de globalización no lograron dejar obsoletas a las naciones, algo que se suponía que iban a hacer (Anderson, 1991; Billig, 1995; Hogan, 2009); incluso podrían haber intensificado el nacionalismo en todo el mundo durante las últimas décadas (Carretero, 2011; Roshwald, 2006). Desde cada punto de vista disciplinario considerado, la imaginación acerca de la nación puede ser comprendida de diferentes maneras: como un proceso histórico, social o psicológico. Sin embargo, el abordaje es inevitablemente histórico. Cuando el nacionalismo es banal (Billig, 1995) y si practicar y pensar en términos de una nación es considerado como un proceso natural ¿cómo pueden las naciones ser concebidas como imaginadas? La nación sólo puede ser imaginada siempre y cuando no haya existido desde siempre. Tuvo que ser inventada por la Historia nacionalista escrita en primer lugar (véase Hobsbawm & Ranger, 2004). En ese sentido, esta Tesis estudiará cómo la gente imagina a una nación como una cuestión de cómo es representada la Historia nacional. El abordaje psicológico sociocultural que será empleado se encuentra en una relación interdisciplinaria con la historiografía acerca de nación. Investigar cómo la gente imagina a una nación supone, por lo tanto, observar primero cómo la nación ha sido inventada, teniendo en cuenta que la nación y su relato surgieron y comenzaron estructurando las representaciones de las personas en el siglo XIX.

Anderson (1991) ofrece una explicación intrincada sobre los procesos históricos que en diferentes contextos dieron lugar a 'comunidades imaginadas'. Sitúa la posibilidad de imaginar a la nación en la interacción entre el surgimiento del sistema capitalista de producción y las relaciones productivas, la imprenta como tecnología de comunicación, y la "fatalidad de la diversidad lingüística humana" (1991, p. 43). Superando la enorme diversidad de las lenguas vernáculos habladas y la dominación latina del lenguaje impreso, los modos unificados de comunicación establecidos por la imprenta concedieron un poder administrativo que más adelante podría ser "explotado con un espíritu maquiavélico" (p. 45). Según Anderson, los medios para imaginar la nación surgieron de una manera semi fortuita, pero llegaron a constituir modelos formales de imitación que fueron utilizados estratégicamente. En este sentido, la manera en que colectiva e individualmente se ha imaginado la nación tiene mucho que ver con 'la invención de la tradición', tal como es explicado por Hobsbawm y Ranger (2004).

La 'tradición inventada' es tomada para referirse a un conjunto de prácticas, normalmente regidas por reglas abierta o tácitamente aceptadas y de naturaleza ritual o simbólica, que

tratan de inculcar ciertos valores y normas de comportamiento por medio de la repetición, lo que implica automáticamente una continuidad con el pasado. De hecho, en lo posible, normalmente tratan de establecer la continuidad con un pasado histórico adecuado. [...] Sin embargo, si es que existe dicha referencia a un pasado histórico, la peculiaridad de las tradiciones 'inventadas' es que la continuidad de las mismas es en gran medida artificial. (2004, p. 1-2; traducción propia).

A lo que los autores se refieren es que las naciones fueron inventadas. La invención de la tradición buscó principalmente establecer la cohesión social y simbolizar la pertenencia a comunidades reales o artificiales. Es más, la invención de la tradición buscó establecer y legitimar la autoridad y las instituciones, y socializar en términos de ciertas creencias, valores y comportamientos. Este proceso fue particularmente intenso en Europa entre 1870 y 1914, año en que comenzó la Primera Guerra Mundial marcando el apogeo del nacionalismo historiográfico (Berger & Conrad, 2015). Anderson (1991) también analiza el nacionalismo en las Américas que precedió al nacionalismo europeo y, que tuvo más que ver con la independencia del dominio colonial que con el fortalecimiento de gobierno imperial. Los diferentes contextos viabilizaron diferentes imaginaciones posibles para las clases políticas. Sin embargo, una nación difícilmente pueda ser concebida sin una historia que establezca su existencia. Los primeros relatos históricos sobre nación fueron escritos en el período de la invención de la tradición, indicado anteriormente. Cuando Hobsbawm presenta a la nación como una construcción social moderna y observa que "definir a una nación por la conciencia de pertenencia a ella que tienen sus miembros es tautológica y sólo proporciona una guía a posteriori sobre lo que es una nación" (1992, p. 7-8; traducción propia), esto puede ser aplicado a muchos contextos diferentes. En términos generales, los procesos históricos hicieron posible la imaginación de una nación, pero la consecuente invención de nación ha hecho que es difícil relacionarse con el pasado de cualquier otra manera que no sea a través de los formatos nacionales. Como se desarrollará más adelante, los modelos formales y tradiciones inventadas de nación han determinado en gran medida la representación de la Historia.

Esta introducción general posicionará a las publicaciones que constituyen esta Tesis en un campo interdisciplinario interesado en la representación de la Historia nacional. Como se verá más adelante, la Historia nacional fue desarrollada y posteriormente disputada activamente en la historiografía y en la enseñanza de la Historia. Existen tensiones significativas en estos campos dedicados a la producción de representaciones del pasado nacional. La investigación de cómo, en última instancia, la gente representa al pasado se encuentra en estas controversias sobre qué Historia escribir y enseñar y de quién son las historias que es preciso incluir. Los estudios empíricos acerca del aprendizaje y representación de la Historia por parte de los

estudiantes, sugieren que las tensiones en la producción de la Historia nacional se traduzcan como tensiones en la representación del pasado nacional. Sin embargo, esto requiere de una investigación más detallada. Esta Tesis intenta contribuir al estudio de ésta tensión y proporcionar una respuesta a la pregunta de cómo los estudiantes representan a la Historia nacional, o mejor dicho, cómo se apropian de manera activa de los relatos producidos acerca de la nación. Se aproximará a la representación de la Historia nacional como una ‘acción mediada’ (Wertsch, 1998). En otras palabras, el modo en que los estudiantes representan el pasado nacional es considerado un asunto de cómo estudiantes utilizan las herramientas culturales que tienen a su disposición. La herramienta cultural clave es, tal como será sugerido, la *narrativa maestra* (‘master narrative’) histórica nacional. Esta narrativa está íntimamente relacionada con la historiografía inicial nacionalista, con ciertos objetivos de la enseñanza de Historia y con la memoria colectiva. El modo en que la narrativa maestra determina las representaciones de los estudiantes acerca de la Historia nacional y, cómo afecta a su comprensión histórica, por un lado, y a su identificación nacional por el otro, será investigado y analizado en los capítulos de esta Tesis. Finalmente, esta introducción general especificará más sobre el contexto en el cuál se realizó esta investigación: Argentina.

LA NACIÓN Y LA HISTORIOGRAFÍA

La Historia, como disciplina académica, fue desarrollada durante la misma época en que las naciones eran ‘inventadas’. Los procesos descritos por Anderson (1991) posibilitaron el surgimiento de nuevas maneras de pensar la Historia y también permitieron que éstas fuesen institucionalizadas nacionalmente. La Historia ha estado entrelazada con el concepto de nación durante el desarrollo de la disciplina en Europa, Asia, África, América Latina y el Pacífico, y se trató, sobretodo, de historia nacional (Ballantyne, 2005; Berger & Conrad, 2015). Muchos historiadores participaron activamente en la construcción de las naciones, ya fuese en las políticas nacionalistas o en la elaboración y consolidación de las identidades nacionales. El historiador y político alemán Heinrich von Treitschke, por ejemplo, escribió la influyente obra *Historia de Alemania en el siglo XIX* y apuntó explícitamente a "saber cómo despertar en los corazones de sus lectores [...] la alegría de la madre patria." (Citado en Berger, 2012, p. 37; traducción propia). Bartolomé Mitre, historiador argentino y presidente de 1862 a 1868, fue el ‘jefe creador’ de la Historia oficial de Argentina. Su inicial y selectiva *Galería de celebridades argentinas* pasó a convertirse en la primera obra de referencia sobre la Historia argentina, a pesar de que su ‘ficción orientadora’ no fue ni la única ni estaba libre de sesgo político (Shumway, 1991). La relación entre la escritura de la Historia y el estado-nación ha sido apropiadamente denominada el ‘contrato narrativo’ (Kaviraj, 1992). De hecho, los historiadores

Von Treitschke y Mitre escribieron historia *para* la nación. En otras palabras, sus trabajos sostienen las 'tradiciones inventadas' (Hobsbawm & Ranger 2004) que legitiman a las instituciones o tienen como objetivo socializar en nombre de la nación.

Durante el último siglo, se produjeron cambios significativos en la historiografía. La escuela de los *Annales* criticó el enfoque exclusivo en la política nacional, presentó una visión más amplia sobre la *longue durée* y propuso una colaboración con la sociología, la economía, la geografía y las ciencias humanas a principios del siglo XX. Durante la segunda mitad del siglo, se desarrollaron enfoques innovadores como la *microhistoria*, la *historia de la mujer* ('Herstory') o la *Gran Historia* ('Big History'). Estos abordajes propusieron observar al pasado en términos de períodos y procesos muy específicos, evitar una 'mirada masculina' ('male gaze') sesgada o contemplar al cuadro general con la inclusión de la astronomía, la geología y la antropología. En la actualidad, la disciplina tiene muchos enfoques y diferentes perspectivas que apuntan a vencer a la crítica post-moderna y a la historiografía tradicional (Burke, 2001). Hubo mucha reflexión crítica acerca del trabajo del historiador y sus métodos (por ejemplo, Bloch, 1953; Carr, 1961; Fischer, 1970; Le Goff & Nora, 1985; Megill, 2007). Incluso los conceptos de la historiografía, desde 'democracia' a 'Historia' en sí, han sido considerados como conceptos históricos, desarrollados y modificados con el paso del tiempo (Koselleck, 1975; 2004). Sin embargo, aún puede observarse en la historiografía una "tensión analítica entre lo nacional y el imperativo de trascenderlo en simultáneo" (Berger, 2012, p. 34). La historicidad de la nación, sobre la que Anderson (1991) y Hobsbawm (1992) dan cuenta, está en desacuerdo con un enfoque nacional del pasado. Una nación por sí misma solamente puede ser explicada en un contexto histórico más amplio. De lo contrario, como en un mito de origen nacional (Smith, 1991), tiene que darse lugar a sí misma y se vuelve tautológica, o existe en su proyección en el futuro y se vuelve teleológica. Cabe la posibilidad de que el desarrollo histórico no pueda ser entendido o explicado sin el concepto de nación, porque el pensamiento en términos de nación generó consecuencias y prácticas reales, pero el desarrollo histórico no puede explicarse completamente en términos nacionales. Por lo tanto, desde 1980, la historiografía se ha vuelto más transnacional y comparativa (Berger, 2011; Iriye & Saunier, 2009). En la disciplina continúa existiendo una tensión normativa entre los historiadores que quieren separar la Historia de la formación de la identidad nacional y los interesados en una Historia que contribuye a la solidaridad dentro del estado (Berger, 2012). Esta tensión normativa se hace aún más evidente en la relación entre la nación y la enseñanza de la Historia, ya que la historiografía nacional no puede ser separada fácilmente de su objetivo educacional inherente. De acuerdo con Hobsbawm (1992), la Historia nacional 'nació para ser enseñada'.

La naturaleza programática de las naciones inventadas, es resumida apropiadamente por Hobsbawm cuando cita a Massimo d'Azeglio: "Hemos hecho a Italia, ahora tenemos que hacer a los italianos" (1992, p 44.). Un pasado en común fue considerado crucial para el desarrollo de un sentido compartido de la identidad o el apego emocional a la nación (Smith, 1991). La misión de crear identidades nacionales se vio facilitada en gran medida por otro desarrollo histórico: el entonces expansivo sistema educativo.

La historiografía moderna y la escuela estatal [...] nacen en un mismo hogar y las vemos juntas en sus primeras fotografías familiares. Desde el comienzo, la historia es parte de la "forma" de la escuela, y también una asignatura, un "contenido". Es el punto de articulación clave entre Estado y sociedad, entre razón y nación, que valida la función formadora y legitimadora de la escuela. Si las naciones son, en cierto sentido, ficciones historiográficas, la escolarización y la enseñanza de la historia adquieren un carácter estratégico y estructural tal que lleva a las teorías más críticas del siglo XX a considerarlas aparatos de reproducción ideológica del Estado. (Carretero, 2011, p. 8; traducción del autor).

La enseñanza inicial de la Historia fue dirigida explícitamente a la construcción de la identidad nacional. Durante el establecimiento de la educación pública obligatoria hacia la mitad del Siglo XX, la Historia inculcó, en conjunto con la geografía y el idioma nacional, los valores de la nación. En Europa esto sucedió en un contexto de fomento de conflicto internacional. Esto se ve exquisitamente ilustrado en los primeros minutos de la película sobre la Primera Guerra Mundial, *Joyeux Noël* (2005), que muestra a tres niños de Francia, Alemania e Inglaterra en sus respectivas escuelas, recitando versos escolares nacionalistas cargados de hostilidad internacional.

La enseñanza de la Historia también experimentó cambios durante el siglo pasado; sin embargo, los planes de estudio y libros de texto de la Historia escolar continúan repletos de contenido nacional (Foster & Crawford, 2006; Symcox & Wilschut, 2009). A menudo, los manuales de Historia mantienen un estilo oficial de 'la mejor narrativa' ('best narrative') abiertamente nacionalista en todo el mundo (Foster, 2012) y muchos contenidos curriculares continúan siendo influenciados por sus propósitos originales de socialización y construcción de la identidad nacional (Nakou & Barca, 2010). En los Estados Unidos, la Historia escolar tiene como objetivo enseñar el 'credo americano' ('American creed'), conformado y contenido en los libros de texto (VanSledright, 2008). Un pasado compartido es considerado fundamental para la construcción de identidades colectivas aún en la actualidad y la enseñanza de la Historia se considera crucial en este sentido (Seixas, 2004). Esto resulta particularmente claro en el

renovado interés por lo nacional de los planes de estudio (Grever & Stuurman, 2007; Symcox & Wilschut, 2009; van der Leeuw-Roord, 2007). Por cierto, la Historia escolar no se ha centrado exclusivamente en la glorificación de lo nacional. En cierta medida se han considerado los desarrollos en la historiografía y en la memoria colectiva, incluyendo el valor de la investigación histórica sistemática y la inclusión de otras identidades (de género, étnicas, cívicas) y versiones alternativas de la Historia. La enseñanza de la Historia fue debatida y reformada en los años 1960, 1970 y 1980 en varios países (Symcox & Wilschut, 2009; Foster, 2012). Relacionada con el decreciente interés en la Historia, una crisis educacional obligó a la disciplina a restablecer su lugar en el plan de estudios, haciendo foco en su método y conocimiento particular (Symcox & Wilschut, 2009). Las habilidades del pensamiento histórico que caracterizan a la historiografía contemporánea, como la comparación entre fuentes y el entendimiento del tiempo histórico, adquirieron un lugar en la enseñanza de la Historia. El pensamiento histórico -en términos de comprensión histórica, razonamiento histórico, conciencia histórica o empatía histórica- continúa siendo desarrollado como un objetivo educativo (Lee, 2004; Lévesque, 2008; Rüsen, 2004; Seixas, 2004; van Drie & van Boxtel, 2008; Wineburg, 2001). Ha habido tensiones entre los defensores de un abordaje nacional tradicional y los opositores que enfatizan la naturaleza disciplinaria e interpretativa de la Historia (Foster, 2012; Lee, 2007). La enseñanza de habilidades disciplinarias fue puesta en tela de juicio por un renovado interés en un canon nacional y enseñanza del patrimonio ('heritage education') (Grever & Stuurman, 2007). En este sentido, hubo un debate sobre si el pasado nacional debería ser abordado y entendido como un 'país extranjero' ('foreign country') o si los estudiantes deberían ser capaces de identificar o sentir empatía con el pasado (Grever, de Bruijn & van Boxtel, 2012; Lowenthal, 2000; Seixas, 2004). Los debates educativos y políticos sobre cuál Historia enseñar, también conocidos como 'guerras de la historia' ('history wars'), continúan afectando al aula (Taylor & Guyver, 2011). La enseñanza de la Historia es controversial en todo el mundo (Nakou & Barca, 2010). Los intentos por hacer más inclusiva a la enseñanza de la Historia, en términos de Historia 'común' o 'global', se ven confrontados con una realidad cada vez más multicultural, por un lado (Grever, 2012; Seixas, 2012b) y con enfoques tradicionales universalistas, por el otro (Tutiaux -Guillon, 2012).

Barton y Levstik (2004) consideran que la enseñanza de la Historia implica tanto una postura de identificación como una postura analítica. La primera tiene que ver con la Historia nacional en miras a la construcción de una identidad nacional. Sin embargo, la enseñanza de la Historia también es concebida como una contribución a las identidades personales, familiares, pluralistas o cívicas. Es decir, la Historia "nos dice quiénes somos" (p. 45) y permite que los estudiantes identifiquen o reflejen su vida actual con elementos del pasado. Se trata de una postura polémica, ya que el interés o el compromiso con el pasado es considerado un impedimento para conocer o comprender el pasado. La posición analítica involucra aprender las lecciones del

pasado, entender históricamente el presente y a las habilidades de la historiografía. Esto ha implicado un énfasis en el distanciamiento del pasado como para entenderlo en sus propios términos (Lowenthal, 1985; Wineburg, 2001). En la postura anterior, se reconoce el valor de la enseñanza de la Historia para la emancipación social o la participación cívica, en la última se reconoce su valor para la contemplación disciplinada.

Según Carretero (2011), en los objetivos de la enseñanza de la Historia existe una tensión entre construir identidades por un lado y enseñar la Historia como disciplina por otro. A estos objetivos los se considera respectivamente Románticos e Ilustrados. La Historia escolar fue un producto de ambos movimientos intelectuales, pero el primer objetivo está claramente enraizado en el Romanticismo, mientras que el segundo, debido a su relación con la "formación del conocimiento social y la construcción de espíritu crítico [puede] considerarse de origen ilustrado." (p. XXIV). Carretero sostiene que la comprensión racional de los procesos históricos y la adhesión emocional a una representación histórica se relacionan de manera tensa entre sí. Particularmente al considerar el pasado nacional, como es también en el caso de la tensión analítica descrita anteriormente (Berger, 2012), una mirada disciplinaria y una mirada romántica son contradictorias. Carretero (2011) integra muchos estudios previos (Barton, 2002; Barton & Levstik, 2004, 2008; Carretero, Asensio & Pozo, 1991; Carretero, López-Manjón & Jacott, 1997; Carretero & Voss, 1994; Foster & Crawford, 2006; Lee, 2005, 2007; Monte-Sano, 2010; Nakou & Barca, 2010) al establecer que los objetivos de la enseñanza de la Historia han sido:

'conocer el pasado'

- A) entender el pasado de una manera compleja, desarrollando el dominio de las categorías conceptuales de la disciplina, tales como 'nación'
- B) distinguir diferentes periodos históricos a través de la adecuada comprensión del tiempo histórico
- C) comprender las multi-causalidades históricas complejas, en las que las motivaciones y los factores causales interactúan de manera intrincada
- D) acercarse a la metodología utilizada por los historiadores, a la investigación y la reflexión sobre la construcción del conocimiento histórico
- E) relacionar el pasado con el presente y el futuro, y en consecuencia con las ciencias sociales y la educación cívica

- A) una evaluación positiva del pasado, presente y futuro del propio grupo nacional
- B) una actitud positiva respecto de la evolución política del país
- C) la identificación con las características, hechos y personajes del pasado nacional

Una de las principales preocupaciones con la enseñanza de la Historia que aspira a cumplir con objetivos románticos, es su vulnerabilidad frente a “la manipulación de los significaciones sobre el pasado común como estrategia crucial de imposición hegemónica” (Carretero, 2011, p. 30; traducción del autor). En este sentido, el objetivo de la comprensión crítica de la Historia desafía al esencialismo nacional y a la legitimación nacional de los eventos pasados o, al ‘uso político del pasado’ (Levi & Revel, 2002; Chiaramonte, 2013). Sin duda, es impresionante cómo los cambiantes paisajes políticos implicaron cambios en los planes de estudio de la Historia escolar (Ahonen, 1997; Grever & Stuurman, 2007).

El uso político del pasado, o su abordaje romántico, parece particularmente bien presentado por el formato primordialmente narrativo que la Historia nacional adquiere en la enseñanza de la Historia. Como se vio en la ‘invención de la tradición’, la estrategia política y la Historia nacional se entrelazaron en la creación de naciones e identidades nacionales (Hobsbawm & Ranger, 2004). La gran narrativa romántica de la nación, o el *mito de origen* (Smith, 1991), fue fundamental para la simbolización de la unidad nacional y para inculcar un sentido de pertenencia nacional. Puede que esta gran narrativa no sea tan importante para la enseñanza de la Historia en la actualidad, como si lo fue a principios del Siglo XX. Como consecuencia de las guerras mundiales libradas, e inspiradas tanto por la historiografía crítica que trasciende a la historia nacional como por la memoria colectiva que contribuyó con relatos alternativos a la historia oficial, la reflexión acerca del nacionalismo fue incrementándose. La memoria colectiva y los relatos de los militantes políticos, por ejemplo, fueron de gran importancia en la Argentina para otorgarle a la dictadura militar (1976-1983) un lugar apropiado en la historia reciente del país (Jelin, 2003). En la Unión Soviética, en particular cuando la *glasnost* y la *perestroika* fueron establecidas, la exclusión oficial de otras voces y versiones del pasado fue contrarrestada con la recuperación de la memoria colectiva en Europa del Este (Brossat, Combe, Potel & Szurek, 1990). Sin embargo, esto también allanó el camino a nuevos nacionalismos y la actuales políticas nacionalistas rusas se encuentran de nuevo acompañadas y legitimado por unas particulares construcciones narrativas de la Historia (Levintova, 2012). Los planes de estudio y los libros de texto, aún o de nuevo, tienden a centrarse en la Historia de la nación y a organizarse a partir una perspectiva nacional. Es más, la narrativa ha sido el vehículo principal en la enseñanza de la Historia (Barton & Levstik, 2004). Los libros de texto y los programas de estudio sobre Historia

sostienen narrativas 'oficiales' (Foster, 2012; VanSledright, 2008) y los 'grandes relatos' aparecen en el plan de estudios una y otra vez, a pesar de los cambios curriculares superficiales que se realizan (Aldridge, 2006). La afirmación de Ferro (1984-2002), acerca de que a los niños de todo el mundo se les relata el pasado de un modo particularmente sesgado, sigue siendo pertinente a pesar del mayor énfasis en la comprensión disciplinar de la Historia. Es decir, en muchos casos, no es sólo una cuestión de Historia escolar, sino de cultura histórica general, o de historia 'popular' o cotidiana, usando la denominación de Carretero (2011). El compartir un pasado en común, que es considerado tan fundamental para un sentido nacional de identidad (Smith, 1991), también se ve facilitado en gran medida por narrativas afuera de la escuela.

NACIÓN, NARRATIVA Y MEMORIA COLECTIVA

Los rituales patrióticos y las celebraciones comunes en muchos países de (Latino-) América (Bertoni, 2001; Grimson, 2007; Westheimer, 2007), están en el límite entre la Historia escolar y la memoria colectiva. En Argentina, Brasil, Chile y Uruguay estos rituales se llevan a cabo en la escuela primaria, en los días de celebración patriótica general. La Historia nacional es representada durante estas ocasiones a través de un formato narrativo (Carretero, 2011). En Argentina, el 25 de mayo de cada año los niños se disfrazan, como si fuesen el 'pueblo' de 1810 que exige saber que está sucediendo en el interior de la entonces casa de gobierno y que celebra la independencia que venía en camino. De esta manera el acontecimiento histórico del 25 de mayo de 1810 en Buenos Aires se convierte en una parte fundamental de la historia nacional de la independencia, tal como el presidente Mitre lo consideró a finales del Siglo XIX, en su versión de los hechos (Shumway, 1991). El evento en sí, fue uno más entre de los muchos debates que hubo sobre autonomía política en la colonia española y la independencia fue un tema de debate durante varios años después (Lynch, 2009). La elaboración de una identidad argentina llevó incluso más tiempo (Chiaramonte, 1989; 1991). Sin embargo, lo que queda plasmado en la memoria colectiva no es el proceso complejo y conflictivo, sino la celebración del nacimiento de la nación. Los escenarios de estos rituales patrióticos imparten un conocimiento específico del pasado nacional que pueden influir en que se logre una comprensión más disciplinaria de la Historia nacional más adelante (Carretero, 2011). Los rituales resultan, en cualquier caso, eficaces para el recuerdo de las sociedades, a través de hábitos repetidos que son difíciles de olvidar y de actos performativos de transferencia de una generación a la siguiente (Connerton, 1989). Las ceremonias conmemorativas son una manera activa de socializar en términos de un pasado común y, en Argentina se introdujeron con este mismo propósito a fines del Siglo XIX (Bertoni, 2001).

Aparte de estos rituales, los *mitos de origen* se encuentran en muchos artefactos educativos y culturales (Jovchelovitch, 2012). A través de monumentos, museos y los medios de comunicación, la Historia nacional forma parte de la memoria colectiva. La memoria colectiva, en lugar de exponer la capacidad de un grupo para recordar (Halbwachs, 1992), se refiere a las representaciones del pasado compartidas por un grupo (Wertsch, 2002). La memoria colectiva se encuentra en la interacción de un ser humano con otro o de un ser humano con los artefactos culturales. A menudo, toma la forma de una narrativa y tiene una importante función de definir y mantener las identidades colectivas (Licata & Mercy, en prensa). Por lo tanto, la Historia nacional puede ser considerada como una especie de memoria colectiva, ya que sostiene y legitima a la nación. Según Billig (1995), el 'abanderamiento' nacional suele suceder de manera implícita, en las calles con nombres de héroes nacionales o en el uso discursivo de 'nosotros' para referirse a la propia nación en oposición a 'ellos', que pertenecen a otra. La nación está más claramente presente en numerosos *lieux de mémoire*, tal como los llamó Nora (1984-1992). Los museos nacionales (Knell, Aronson, et al., 2011) tienden a presentar el pasado nacional "como una entidad coherente, organizado que está esperando a ser representada por las narrativas históricas" (González de Oleaga, 2012, p. 249; traducción propia). Las enormes estatuas de figuras patrióticas expresan las heroicas proezas del pasado nacional y establecen ejemplos morales. Las películas dan una coherencia narrativa y una importancia dramática a la lucha y a la gloria nacional. La memoria colectiva es selectiva (Ricoeur, 2004), así como es una trama narrativa (Bruner, 1990; Polkinghorne, 2005), más aún si se centra en la nación. Es por eso que puede ser olvidadiza, de manera accidental o a propósito, respecto de otras identidades, historias y recuerdos. Esta vulnerabilidad distingue a la memoria colectiva de la investigación sistemática del pasado propuesta por la historiografía contemporánea (Ricoeur, 2004; Rosa, 2006). Aún así, la memoria colectiva y la representación del patrimonio no necesitan estar en oposición a la comprensión histórica: en los museos, una exposición bien organizada, podría permitir que los visitantes se acerquen a la Historia nacional de una manera más disciplinaria, al ofrecer la oportunidad de comparar el pasado y el presente o de construir narrativas complejas sobre el pasado (Grever, de Bruijn & van Bortel, 2012). La memoria colectiva puede contribuir a la enseñanza de la Historia disciplinaria cuando busca expandir los horizontes, en lugar de enfocarse en una historia 'verdadera' o gloriosa. De todos modos, al margen de la educación formal de la Historia, que cuando se refiere a la nación se trata más un ejercicio de la memoria colectiva que de la historiografía, muchos artefactos culturales son fuentes importantes para el aprendizaje de la historia y la representación de la Historia nacional (Carretero, 2011). Por lo tanto, los relatos de nación que circulan en la enseñanza de la Historia y más ampliamente en la cultura histórica, pueden determinar en gran medida cómo la gente ve el pasado.

El aprendizaje de la Historia y cómo las personas se representan en última instancia a la Historia nacional ha sido tradicionalmente abordado desde la psicología cognitiva constructivista y educativa, así como también cada vez más, desde la psicología social y política y, más recientemente, desde la psicología cultural (Carretero & Bermúdez, 2012). Las diferentes contribuciones empíricas serán consideradas aquí.

En la línea de la psicología evolutiva, los estudios realizados y revisados por Barrett y Buchanan-Barrow (2005; Barrett, 2007), indicaron que los niños de entre 6 y 8 años ya pueden hacer la distinción entre un 'nosotros' nacional y un 'ellos' extranjero y, que la valoración afectiva del país se desarrolla mucho antes del conocimiento del país al cual el niño pertenece (véase también Del Barrio, Hoyos, Padilla & Lara, 2013). Un estudio sobre la representación de la identidad nacional por niños y adolescentes muestra que hay varios etapas, desde representar la nacionalidad como una característica fija definida por el lugar de nacimiento en alrededor de 7 años de edad, tras una característica modificable por migración, hasta una característica cívico-política otorgando derechos, que involucra la comprensión del proceso político-legal de adquirir una nacionalidad, a partir de 10 años de edad (Hoyos & del Barrio, 2006). En el mismo estudio se encontró que la valoración afectiva varía por país y, además, se ha encontrado ambivalencia en la valoración, que no siempre tiene que ser positiva (Del Barrio et al., 2013). En la psicología evolutiva, la construcción de la identidad nacional se relaciona por un lado al estudio de la comprensión de la sociedad, fuertemente vinculado al aprendizaje, o, por otro, al desarrollo de un 'yo' colectivo: la identidad nacional como parte del sí mismo. Desde hace tiempo se ha investigado la identidad nacional como un conocimiento social en niños y adolescentes, pero el desarrollo de la identidad nacional como faceta del 'yo' se ha considerado relativamente poco (Del Barrio et al., 2013). Más allá del trabajo clásico sobre desarrollo de la identidad en la adolescencia (Erikson, 1968), el trabajo en la línea de la teoría de la identidad social (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) y, en la línea de aculturación de inmigrantes (Berry, 1980), mucho trabajo sobre la construcción de la identificación nacional aún queda por hacer. Con respecto al trabajo sobre el desarrollo de la distinción entre 'nosotros' y 'ellos', se puede discutir acerca de si esto es una consecuencia del desarrollo cognitivo o del aprendizaje. Sin embargo, es notable que el desarrollo de esta distinción coincida con los primeros años de escolarización. También coincide con el desarrollo de lo que Egan (1997) llamó 'comprensión romántica' en la mente educada.

Las investigaciones sobre el aprendizaje de la Historia han aumentado considerablemente en las últimas décadas y se han centrado primordialmente en los niños y adolescentes que asisten a la escuela. Al revisar estudios sobre lo que los estudiantes saben acerca del pasado, Barton (2008)

hizo hincapié en que los niños desarrollan una comprensión del tiempo histórico desde una edad temprana y progresan de una secuencia cronológica general de los acontecimientos históricos a una conciencia más nítida de la dimensión temporal del pasado, acerca de la distinción entre periodos y la relación entre los acontecimientos. Sin embargo, lo que saben sobre el pasado desde los últimos años de la primaria en adelante, se relaciona principalmente con la Historia nacional. A menudo se les enseña la Historia nacional antes de que sean capaces de desarrollar esquemas temporales complejos que les permitan diferenciar el pasado remoto del pasado reciente (Barton, 2002; Carretero, Asensio & Pozo, 1991). Además, lo que los alumnos saben y cómo lo saben es en gran medida estructurado por narrativas (Barton, 2008; Barton & Levstik, 2004) y cuando se les pregunta acerca de ciertos temas históricos responden contando un relato narrativo. Con frecuencia, la narración simplifica su conocimiento y comprensión de los contenidos históricos, además de facilitar la omisión de perspectivas alternativas o detalles específicos. En ese sentido, hay una significativa estructuración narrativa del pasado (Polkinghorne, 2005), probablemente relacionada con el desarrollo del 'pensamiento narrativo' y a la apropiación de las narrativas colectivas desde edades tempranas (Bruner, 1990; Egan, 1997; Wertsch, 1998). En concreto, esto significa que en su mente los acontecimientos históricos están organizados de una manera coherente, en torno a un tema común y a un protagonista nacional (Barton & Levstik, 1998). Los estudiantes pueden llegar a comprender la narrativa histórica como la interpretación de un historiador, o entender que hay errores accidentales o estratégicos en los relatos históricos. Pero a menudo comienzan pensando que el pasado es la historia (Lee & Ashby, 2000) y, a pesar de que ellos desarrollan una meta-comprensión de las narrativas como representaciones en lugar de realidades, ciertos elementos de estas narrativas son difíciles de modificar. Por ejemplo, es difícil cambiar la concepción de nación como una esencia atemporal y pasar a concebirla como una construcción histórico-social; incluso ambas conceptualizaciones pueden coexistir en las representaciones del pasado nacional (Carretero, Castorina & Levinas, 2013; Carretero & Kriger, 2011; López, Carretero & Rodríguez-Moneo, 2014a). Estos autores sugieren que un cambio conceptual respecto de la idea de nación está relacionado con la narrativa nacional, en la cual está incorporado el concepto de nación y a través de la cual, a su vez, este concepto se ve realizado (véase también Castorina, Carretero, Barreiro, van Alphen & Sarti, 2015). En este sentido, el desarrollo del pensamiento histórico puede ser entendido como la superación de las concepciones esencialistas sobre la nación y de las narrativas románticas que las sostienen (Carretero, Castorina & Levinas, 2013; López, Carretero & Rodríguez-Moneo, 2014a). Esta Tesis, como se verá más adelante, se ha desarrollado en el marco de esta línea de investigación.

Muchos estudios empíricos, se han centrado en cómo los estudiantes desarrollan las diferentes habilidades del pensamiento histórico, a partir de su inclusión gradual en los planes de estudio

de la Historia y de las ciencias sociales. Los contenidos históricos utilizados para estas investigaciones son, con frecuencia, partes de la Historia nacional (por ejemplo Afflerbach & VanSledright, 2001; Lee, Dickinson & Ashby, 1997; van Drie & van Boxtel, 2004; Wineburg, 1991). Es probable que esto se deba más a que los planes de estudios de los países de los investigadores contienen dichos contenidos nacionales, que a la preferencia misma de los investigadores. Aun así, indica que el énfasis en enseñar y estudiar la comprensión histórica no necesariamente implica el abandono de la Historia nacional. En general, se ha encontrado que el pensamiento histórico es un 'acto antinatural' para los estudiantes (Wineburg, 2001). En este sentido, la historia es difícil de aprender, debido al '*presentismo*', la tendencia a ver el pasado desde la perspectiva actual. Tanto el uso crítico de las fuentes como la comprensión de que las perspectivas históricas son diferentes a las suyas, son habilidades difíciles de adquirir para los estudiantes (véase una revisión general en Barton, 2008). Además, las explicaciones causales que los estudiantes emplean tienden a ser anecdóticas y personalistas, porque no tienen en cuenta el rol de los sistemas e instituciones sociales, políticas y económicas (Carretero, López-Manjón & Jacott, 1997; Halldén, 1998; Lee & Ashby, 2001). Consideran a los procesos históricos como una cuestión de motivación individual o como una intención psicológica, incluso al explicar los acontecimientos políticos y económicos (Brophy & VanSledright, 1997; Rivière, Núñez & Fontela, 1998). Los adolescentes de más edad y los adultos incluyen dimensiones sociales en sus explicaciones, pero se encontró que aceptar información nueva que entre en conflicto con sus explicaciones previas puede ser difícil incluso para los expertos en historia (Limón & Carretero, 1999). Los estudiantes más jóvenes progresan a través de las intervenciones relacionadas con las diferentes habilidades del pensamiento histórico (Barton, 2008), y lo hacen desde una comprensión más concreta a una más abstracta de los conceptos históricos (Berti & Andriolo, 2001; Carretero & Lee, 2014). La aceptación de perspectivas y versiones diferentes a sus ideas políticas o éticas es, sin embargo, difícil (Seixas & Clark, 2004). Los estudiantes mayores pueden ser fascinados por la extrañeza del pasado, pero hay mayor interés por la Historia cuando los estudiantes aprenden de fuentes informales y cuando se trata de cómo la historia afecta a la vida de las personas (Barton, 2008). Ante estos hallazgos, es probable que las identidades y los valores de los alumnos influyan en su comprensión acerca del pasado. Esto ha sido abordado por estudios sobre el aprendizaje de la Historia y por la psicología social y política.

En este sentido, se encontró que el contexto social, los antecedentes y la identidad de los estudiantes influyen en cuál es contenido histórico que consideran importante, y también la forma en que representan o aprenden la Historia. En el ámbito del aprendizaje de la Historia se investigó cuáles son los acontecimientos históricos que los estudiantes encuentran significativos. Por un lado, se descubrió que la identidad juega un rol relativamente pequeño en la determinación de la significación histórica (Cercadillo, 2001; Seixas, 1994). Por el otro lado,

tanto la identidad nacional y la etnia están explícita o implícitamente relacionadas con lo que ellos consideran importante en la Historia (Epstein, 2000; Grever, Pelzer & Haydn, 2011; Levstik & Groth, 2005; Liu et al., 2012). Además, se encontró que las identidades sociales pueden influir en el aprendizaje y en la representación de la Historia (Epstein & Schiller, 2005; Goldberg, 2013). En este sentido, los valores morales o la identidad social de los estudiantes fueron considerados tanto un recurso para el aprendizaje de la Historia como un impedimento significativo para la comprensión disciplinaria (Bellino & Selman, 2012; Goldberg, 2013; Kolikant & Pollack, 2009; Straub, 2005). En la apropiación narrativa e histórica más amplia, dentro y fuera de la escuela, se considera que las identidades juegan un doble rol. En el ámbito de la psicología social y política, respecto a la relación mutuamente constitutiva entre las narrativas colectivas y la identidad social, la identidad resulta ser una *perjuicio* y un *beneficio* (Hammack, 2010). La identidad resulta una carga "particularmente en tanto a los procesos sociales de reproducción. En este contexto, se concibe a los jóvenes como apropiadores relativamente ciegos de un status quo narrativo participando de esta manera, sin saberlo, en el esencialismo y en la cosificación de la identidad" (Hammack, 2010, p. 174; traducción propia). Por el otro lado, la identidad provee un sentido de individualidad y también de un beneficio colectivo "particularmente a los jóvenes que son miembros de grupos de status social bajo. En este marco, el hincapié se hace en la identidad colectiva como herramienta para el cambio social y la liberación de la opresión" (p. 175; traducción propia). Los estudios sobre el aprendizaje histórico indican que los estudiantes no solo pueden mostrar resistencia a las narrativas históricas que no consideran propias, sino que también aportan perspectivas a la clase de Historia, sobre todo cuando su voz colectiva es ignorada por los contenidos y los relatos históricos oficiales (Barton, 2008; Epstein, 2000). De este modo, una memoria personal, familiar o colectiva contribuye al aprendizaje histórico sin la necesidad de entrar en conflicto con una apreciación disciplinaria de la diversidad de puntos de vista que hay sobre la Historia. En particular, cuando se trata de una historia reciente y controvertida, la identidad y la memoria pueden desempeñar un papel constructivo; sin embargo, los estudios empíricos comenzaron a explorarlo recientemente. Moller (2012) considera que la memoria familiar resulta ser una fuente estimulante y confiable para comprometerse con el pasado: "Cuando son tratadas como distorsiones de la verdad, las *memorias familiares* se convierten en un obstáculo para la enseñanza de la Historia. En su lugar, debemos ayudar a los estudiantes a reconocer que son una fuente muy específica en un universo de fuentes posibles [...] como todas las fuentes puede ser integrada al panorama general, con la utilización de un razonamiento responsable y sistemático."(p. 291-292; traducción propia). Otros estudios apuntan a explorar el desarrollo progresivo de la empatía histórica y la comprensión histórica en conjunto (Bellino & Selman, 2012; Lee & Shemilt, 2011). Por otra parte, cuando las cuestiones todavía controversiales llegan

al aula, las habilidades disciplinarias de la discusión y la reflexión son convenientes pero difíciles de adquirir (Reisman & Wineburg, 2012).

Las identidades sociales han sido investigadas de diferentes maneras en relación con el aprendizaje de la Historia. Como hemos visto, a menudo son consideradas como una variable que influye en la representación histórica. Por otro lado, también se ha observado que en la historiografía y en la educación, la identidad nacional se construye por medio de una representación histórica y que la misma precisa de una investigación psicológica más extensa. Se han realizado investigaciones considerables en el ámbito de la categorización social, que explica la identidad nacional en términos de los mismos procesos que tienen lugar en el caso de otras identidades sociales: los procesos de un endo-grupo (in-group) frente al exo-grupo (out-group) (Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Turner et al., 1987). La identidad nacional es entonces una categoría social acogida por el conflicto intergrupal. Los psicólogos sociales Reicher y Hopkins (2001) y Billig (1995) advierten que la nación y el nacionalismo son frecuentemente naturalizados y que la identidad nacional es una categoría histórica tanto como una categoría social. Proponen estudiar el discurso nacional o político, ya que contribuye a la naturalización de la nación. En este sentido, la representación histórica fue instada a influir en la categorización social en lugar de que ocurra a la inversa. Desde otra perspectiva psicosocial, se ha sostenido que un conjunto selectivo de acontecimientos históricos significativos permite el posicionamiento en términos de identidades étnicas, nacionales y supranacionales (Liu & Hilton, 2005). Un ingenioso estudio empírico realizado por López, Carretero & Rodríguez-Moneo (2014b) evitó considerar la identidad nacional como una variable independiente al variar los contenidos históricos nacionales del estudio. De este modo, se investigó cómo los estudiantes representan una historia nacional que no es la suya, para observar cómo su representación difiere de la manera en que representan a su propia historia nacional. El abordaje sociocultural adoptado en este estudio se especificará a continuación. Como podrá verse, este enfoque permite estudiar un mecanismo de interiorización que une a la cultura y la cognición, la Historia y la psicología y, permite investigar más a fondo la relación entre el aprendizaje de la Historia y la identidad nacional.

Dadas las tensiones entre la historiografía y la enseñanza de la Historia, así como también los resultados de los estudios de aprendizaje de la Historia, es probable que en la representación individual del pasado nacional exista una compleja tensión entre la identificación nacional y la contemplación histórico-crítica. Carretero y Kriger (2011) encontraron que hay una tensión en las narraciones históricas nacionales de los estudiantes, entre por un lado una versión esencialista romántica del pasado nacional y por otro la noción de una nación histórica y socialmente construida. Sin embargo, esta tensión precisa de una investigación más extensa,

teniendo en cuenta que la historiografía, la enseñanza de la Historia, la memoria colectiva y la identificación influyen en cómo es representado, en última instancia, el pasado nacional.

UN ACERCAMIENTO A LA 'NARRATIVA MAESTRA' HISTÓRICA NACIONAL

Esta Tesis Doctoral se sitúa en la tensión que caracteriza a la Historia nacional –según fue observado en la historiografía, la enseñanza de la Historia y, en cierta medida, el aprendizaje de la Historia– entre su función crítica y su función de formar identidades. En esta tensión, el rol de la memoria colectiva, de la identidad y especialmente el de la narrativa precisa ser mejor articulado. Con frecuencia la memoria colectiva toma una forma narrativa y es considerada fundamental para la construcción de identidades colectivas. En teoría, la narrativa constituye la identidad (Ricoeur, 1992). Históricamente, Smith (1991) sostuvo que el *mito de origen* de la nación ha sido fundamental para el establecimiento de las identidades nacionales. La idea de que las narrativas nacionales legitiman y mantienen la identidad nacional también se encuentra detrás de uno de los objetivos de la enseñanza de la Historia, tal como lo distingue Carretero (2011). Además, que las narrativas colectivas sean representadas a nivel individual otorga un apoyo más empírico a esta idea (López, Carretero & Rodríguez-Moneo, 2014a; Wertsch, 2002). Sin embargo, las memorias e identidades colectivas también han sido consideradas fundamentales en su función emancipadora para las minorías y los grupos excluidos del relato oficial o nacional. La historiografía misma construyó historias románticas de la nación, por lo que el intercambio entre la memoria colectiva y la Historia como disciplina, así como su vínculo con la Historia nacional y la Historia escolar, es complejo y controvertido. Además, 'identidad' es una noción problemática. Es una noción histórica tal como 'nación', pero se refiere a fenómenos psicológicos concretos que son fácilmente atribuidos metafóricamente al colectivo (Wertsch, 2002). En este orden de ideas, el supuesto de que la enseñanza de la Historia realmente construye identidades en las personas necesita una justificación teórica, así como una elaboración empírica. Por lo tanto, con respecto a la memoria colectiva y la identidad, consideraciones teóricas adicionales serán presentadas como parte de esta Tesis para reflexionar sobre la controvertida 'construcción de identidades'.

El propósito primordial será analizar más en detalle las tensiones en el aprendizaje o la representación de la Historia nacional: ¿pueden los dos objetivos de la enseñanza de la Historia, que los estudiantes conozcan su pasado y amen a su país, ser alcanzados en simultáneo? Esto necesita no sólo de una consideración teórica, sino también de un análisis empírico de cómo los estudiantes representan la Historia de su nación. En el centro de este análisis, tanto teórica como empíricamente, se encuentra la narrativa histórica de la nación y, específicamente, se empleará un abordaje sociocultural psicológico que se enfocará en las 'narrativas maestras'. Como se verá,

esto puede facilitar el diálogo interdisciplinario entre la Historia, la educación y la psicología. Además, permite una reunión de las aproximaciones constructivistas cognitivas y las aproximaciones psicosociales de la representación de la nación.

Como se comentó anteriormente, las narrativas de nación han construido, mantenido y perpetuado una representación particular del pasado nacional a través de la historiografía, la enseñanza de la Historia, la memoria colectiva y el aprendizaje de la Historia. Estas narrativas corresponden muy bien con la historiografía nacionalista y con el objetivo educativo de formar identidades nacionales. Sin embargo, son muy criticadas por la historiografía contemporánea y consideradas en oposición al objetivo educativo de la formación de pensadores históricos. En este sentido, se supone que la narrativa maestra nacional facilita el 'amor al país' y dificulta 'el conocimiento de su pasado' y necesitaría ser investigada más a fondo. Las *narrativas maestras* (master narratives) serán entendidas como las grandes narrativas de la nación. Los *mitos de origen*, según fueron considerados por Smith (1991), resultan un buen ejemplo. Estos son los relatos que establecen a la idea misma de cada nación y que dan cuenta de su creación. Las *narrativas oficiales*, examinadas por Wertsch y Rozin (2000), son las narrativas implementadas por los regímenes políticos y cuando éstas coinciden con los regímenes nacionales, como sucede con frecuencia, también son narrativas nacionales. Dada la oposición política o las *narrativas no oficiales*, se supone que las narrativas oficiales no son tan ampliamente compartidas como las narrativas maestras. Otro ejemplo de una narrativa maestra que constituye una narrativa continua de lucha y gloria nacional, puede encontrarse en el 'credo americano', tal como fue observado por VanSledright (2008). Según Alridge (2006), bajo este gran relato subyace una variedad de historias que son inmunes a los cambios superficiales en los contenidos históricos y, por ello, se manifiesta una y otra vez en el plan de estudios. Se ha postulado que esto niega a los estudiantes una perspectiva crítica sobre el pasado (Alridge, 2006; VanSledright, 2008). En una línea similar, Heller (2006) describe a las narrativas maestras como patrones de interpretación general que tienen la función de dar sentido al pasado, presente y futuro de una comunidad cultural.

Wertsch (2004) hace una distinción entre las narrativas específicas y los *patrones narrativos esquemáticos* (schematic narrative templates). Estos últimos son formatos narrativos psicológicamente interiorizados, que pueden encontrarse repetidamente en las narrativas específicas que circulan en el ámbito colectivo. Cuando están activos en las mentes individuales, determinan cómo son comprendidas las nuevas informaciones o historias. Esta distinción reconoce en cierta medida que la gente tiene un modo narrativo de pensamiento (Bruner, 1990), pero lo combina con la idea de que las representaciones narrativas están culturalmente disponibles primero y después son interiorizadas individualmente. En este sentido, las

narrativas maestras son relatos específicos que se hallan en diferentes contextos nacionales y que comparten ciertas características, como se presentará más adelante. Sin embargo, a pesar de que tienen un formato común, las narrativas maestras no serán consideradas como patrones narrativos esquemáticos. Serán consideradas como herramientas culturales que la gente usa para representar el pasado nacional. Es por eso que la narrativa maestra que circula en la memoria colectiva no determina automáticamente cómo las personas representan la Historia nacional. En otras palabras, lo que se enseña no es necesariamente aprendido. Esto se explica por un abordaje sociocultural, según lo propuesto por Wertsch (1998; 2002).

El enfoque sociocultural que se centra en las herramientas culturales, representa una manera de superar la dicotomía entre el individuo y el colectivo que ha obstaculizado el intercambio interdisciplinario entre la psicología y las ciencias sociales. En concreto, el análisis sociocultural pretende explicar cómo la acción humana y el contexto cultural, institucional e histórico se relacionan entre sí (Wertsch, 1998). Para el estudio de la acción humana de manera interdisciplinaria y en su complejidad, Wertsch propone tomar la *acción mediada* como unidad de análisis. En lugar de reducir el enfoque al agente individual, la acción mediada reconoce el importante rol de los instrumentos de mediación o *herramientas culturales*, en la acción humana. Los instrumentos de mediación están inherentemente situados en la cultura. Debido a que toda acción humana está mediada por los objetos culturales, símbolos o lenguaje, el arraigo sociocultural de la acción humana está automáticamente implicado en el análisis. Concretamente, estudiar la acción mediada es analizar cómo interactúan los agentes y las herramientas culturales.

Wertsch (1998) hace una distinción entre la *producción* y el *consumo* de las herramientas culturales para caracterizar mejor la interacción entre agente e instrumento. Con respecto a la producción Wertsch afirma que las herramientas culturales se asocian con el poder y la autoridad y, con frecuencia, se desarrollan por otros motivos distintos de la facilitación de la acción mediada. Por lo tanto, en el contexto de la producción de esta Tesis, pueden ser claramente relacionadas con la *invención de la tradición* cristalizada en las narrativas maestras y distribuida a través de la enseñanza de la Historia (por ejemplo, los libros de texto) y la memoria colectiva (por ejemplo, monumentos y museos). La historiografía, la enseñanza de la Historia y la memoria colectiva están involucradas en la producción de herramientas culturales para la representación del pasado. En este sentido, el objetivo principal de producir grandes relatos no ha sido facilitar la representación histórica de la nación, en términos historiográficos, sino más bien construir de la identidad nacional. Como las herramientas culturales no son instrumentos neutros, las narrativas maestras sustentan el poder y la autoridad. Por otro lado, los agentes tienen sus propios objetivos y controles sobre cómo utilizar la herramienta cultural. Con

respecto al consumo, Wertsch hace hincapié en que hay una *tensión irreductible y dinámica* entre el agente y el instrumento en la acción mediada. En ese sentido, "incluso el estudio más exhaustivo sobre la producción de textos no puede decirnos si las narrativas serán utilizadas de la manera prevista por los productores" (Wertsch, 2002, p. 117; traducción propia). La acción no puede ser completamente reducida a las intenciones del mediador o a las determinaciones de la herramienta cultural, pero pueden interactuar de diversas maneras. En primer lugar, las herramientas pueden permitir la acción pero también restringirla. Por ejemplo, las narrativas ofrecen una coherencia que puede ayudar a que los estudiantes aprendan Historia y al mismo tiempo pueden limitar la comprensión histórica de los estudiantes ya que, por coherencia, otros sujetos y acontecimientos históricos son excluidos de la narrativa. En segundo lugar, la forma en que el agente se relaciona con la herramienta cultural puede tomar la forma de *dominio* (mastery) o *apropiación* (appropriation). Un agente no internaliza pasivamente una herramienta cultural, sino que activamente la domina o se apropia de ella. Poseer un dominio sobre la herramienta cultural es saber cómo utilizarla fácilmente:

En el caso de las narrativas históricas [...] el dominio se refleja en la capacidad de recordarlas a voluntad y emplearlas con facilidad al hablar. Pero se extiende también a incluir habilidades tales como ser capaz de usar las narrativas históricas como base para el razonamiento sobre los actores y motivos detrás de los acontecimientos que se están discutiendo. [...] Recae principalmente en el rubro de funcionamiento cognitivo definido de una manera bastante estrecha. Como tal, tiene poco para decir acerca de cualquier compromiso emocional respecto de los textos en cuestión. (Wertsch, 2002, p. 119; traducción propia)

Apropiación significa adueñarse de la herramienta cultural:

La apropiación de recursos textuales se refiere a un tipo de relación diferente entre los agentes y la herramienta cultural y a otro tipo de motivación para el uso de un texto al hablar [:] el proceso de adueñarse de algo. Este proceso implica que el texto tiene un "sentido personal" [...] en oposición a un distanciado "significado" abstracto. Como tal, un texto que es apropiado puede servir como recurso de identidad - un medio para anclar o construir el propio sentido de lo que uno es. (Wertsch, 2002, p. 120; traducción propia)

En el contexto de esta Tesis, el consumo se relaciona con el aprendizaje de la Historia y más específicamente con cómo los estudiantes utilizan la narrativa como una herramienta cultural en su representación del pasado nacional. Por ello, la representación del pasado nacional es la acción humana mediada por la narrativa maestra como herramienta cultural y por tanto su apropiación puede variar. Este enfoque sociocultural permite la integración de la historiografía, la enseñanza de la Historia, la memoria colectiva y los estudios de aprendizaje la Historia en términos de producción y consumo. En concreto, este enfoque considera a la narrativa histórica

como un artefacto cultural, reconoce la controversia entre los existentes diferentes puntos de vista del pasado, le asigna un rol activo al agente en la construcción de narrativas y un rol constitutivo al contexto cultural, y examina la interacción entre la comprensión racional, la emoción y los valores (Carretero & Bermúdez, 2012).

Por otro lado, el análisis de cómo los estudiantes narran el pasado nacional permite a la perspectiva constructivista cognitiva, sobre cómo los estudiantes entienden racionalmente la historia, enriquecerse con el trabajo que muestra la importancia de las emociones, los valores y las identidades, en la construcción de los relatos históricos (Carretero & Bermúdez, 2012). También se ha sugerido que acercarse a la psicología cultural y el estudio de la narrativa permite integrar la psicología social y la Historia en la aproximación de la identidad (Hammack, 2008). Los estudios cognitivos sobre cómo los estudiantes aprenden la Historia nacional y los estudios psicosociales sobre las identidades nacionales en relación con la representación de la Historia pueden encontrarse en el estudio de la narrativa. La apreciación tanto de la nación como un concepto histórico y de la identidad nacional como categoría social, se hace evidente en el modelo de producción y consumo de la narrativa maestra, propuesto por Carretero (2011; Carretero & Bermúdez, 2012). Este modelo que posee bases teóricas y empíricas y, en el cual esta Tesis basa su posterior análisis e investigación, muestra seis características de la narrativa maestra. Las narrativas maestras, de acuerdo con este modelo, se caracterizan por:

- 1) Un *sujeto histórico social y homogéneo*. Es decir, la narrativa tiene un solo sujeto que es homogéneo tanto en oposición al otro histórico como a través del tiempo. No hay variedad ni diversidad de actores históricos y, el sujeto narrativo es idealizado y atemporal. El establecimiento de este protagonista nacional, la voz principal de la narración, implica un proceso de inclusión / exclusión. Por ejemplo, la voz de los pueblos indígenas que viven en el mismo territorio está excluida de la narrativa nacional.
- 2) Los *procesos de identificación, en términos de un "nosotros" frente a "ellos"*. Los narradores o bien se identifican con el sujeto histórico nacional o el "nosotros" refleja la presente identidad nacional proyectada al pasado, o la identificación es a la vez histórica y social. Los sujetos del pasado y presente se funden en una sola identidad nacional, al igual que los diferentes actores sociales.
- 3) *Figuras históricas fundamentales, heroicas y trascendentes*. Estos individuos aparecen en la narración para representar una virtud nacional y dar ejemplo a la nación. Dichas figuras son valoradas positivamente y consideradas fuera de su contexto social e histórico, como personajes cuasi míticos.

4) *Una versión mono causal o teleológica de los acontecimientos históricos*, en términos de un objetivo principal, como la búsqueda de la libertad, una reclamación de territorio o la defensa de los intereses nacionales.

5) *Los juicios morales de valor*, los cuales son positivos acerca del sujeto histórico o el evento nacional y negativos sobre el otro histórico/nacional. Este valor moral nacional es tautológico o posee una autojustificación: lo nacional es bueno, y lo bueno es nacional. En este sentido los sacrificios, desde morir por el país hasta la erradicación de otros grupos y traidores, son por el bien mayor.

6) *Una conceptualización esencialista de la nación y la identidad nacional*, ambas son entidades presentadas como naturales y atemporales. En este sentido el territorio también es caracterizado como esencialmente nacional, o predestinado a serlo.

Los estudios empíricos llevados a cabo en la tradición sociocultural confirman que los estudiantes reproducen las narrativas colectivamente disponibles en Estados Unidos y en Irlanda (Barton, 2001; Barton & McCully, 2005). En cuanto a las características narrativas mencionadas anteriormente, se ha realizado una importante labor en España (López, Carretero & Rodríguez-Moneo, 2014a). Las investigaciones acerca de cómo los estudiantes representan los acontecimientos históricos nacionales se encontraron con que, cuando se les pregunta sobre el evento que marca el origen de la nación, frecuentemente repiten la narrativa maestra. En España este evento es la llamada Reconquista, entendida como un acción de la nación Española que vuelve a conquistar su territorio, combatiendo a los diversos reinos árabes que estuvieron instalados en la península Ibérica durante casi 800 años. Esto es, sin embargo, un mito de origen ya que, históricamente, no hubo una campaña organizada a nivel nacional pero llegó a ser visto como tal en la época romántica en que las narrativas maestras nacionales fueron escritas por toda Europa. El término Reconquista es un derivado de esta época, y nunca fue utilizado, ni podría haberlo sido, en el momento de los hechos histórico (Ríos-Saloma, 2005). Históricamente hablando, cuando llegaron los musulmanes en el año 711, la península estaba habitada principalmente por los visigodos. En 1492, una unión política entre los reinados de Castilla y Aragón, logró derrotar el último bastión de Al-Andalus. El territorio español se estableció tal como es ahora en el Siglo XIX. Sin embargo, la mayoría de los estudiantes adultos que fueron entrevistados consideran que el sujeto histórico de los eventos entre 711 y 1492 es español, que el territorio es esencialmente español y describen los acontecimientos en términos de una – legítima– Reconquista Española (López, Carretero & Rodríguez-Moneo, 2014a). Al investigar cómo los estudiantes españoles adultos explican eventos históricos similares en Grecia se encontró que el sujeto histórico fue considerado como griego, pero no había la misma demanda

nacional sobre el territorio y los acontecimientos no fueron legitimados moralmente en términos de nación como cuando se trataba de la Historia de la propia nación española (López, Carretero & Rodríguez-Moneo, 2014b). Esto indica que la identificación a través de una nacionalidad en común juega un papel importante en la representación del pasado. También indica que el sujeto histórico nacional es una dimensión clave de la narrativa maestra. El modelo de producción y consumo de la narrativa maestra invita a la realización de una investigación más extensa en otros contextos nacionales y, en particular, con los estudiantes más jóvenes que todavía están en el proceso de aprendizaje de la Historia. En esta Tesis, la investigación se centra en los estudiantes argentinos de diferentes edades, en la escuela secundaria, de manera tal que pueda observarse el desarrollo de su representación de la Historia nacional. También se analizará la apropiación de la narrativa maestra de los estudiantes junto al uso político de la historia nacional. Antes de pasar a los objetivos principales de esta Tesis, recapitularemos sobre la cuestión de la imaginación de Argentina, que fue mencionada anteriormente de modo breve y será elaborada aquí.

IMAGINANDO A LA ARGENTINA

Dentro del contexto elaborado más arriba, esta Tesis se centra en el mito de origen argentino (Chiaramonte, 1991). Como se mencionó al principio, Anderson (1991) analizó las diferencias entre los procesos históricos sudamericanos y europeos que dieron lugar a la imaginación de la nación. Los habitantes de las colonias españolas fueron pioneros en comparación con sus homólogos europeos, y por otro lado su 'nacionalismo' en lugar de fortalecer el dominio imperial pasaba por una cuestión de independencia del dominio colonial. Estos movimientos políticos pueden llamarse nacionalistas en el sentido de que eran 'americanos' y antiimperialistas respecto de la corona española. Se les puede llamar 'revolucionarios' en el sentido de que fueron inspirados por la Ilustración y por las revoluciones francesa y norteamericana. Sin embargo, alrededor del 25 de mayo de 1810, las instituciones políticas eran las que había instalado el colonialismo español y el sistema de relaciones de producción dependía casi exclusivamente del comercio con España. En términos de identidad, los habitantes del territorio se consideraban a sí mismo como 'españoles', 'americanos' o 'rioplatenses', según el entonces Virreinato del Río de la Plata (Chiaramonte, 1989). En otras palabras, la nación argentina todavía tenía que ser inventada y el nacionalismo no podría haber sido 'argentino'. De acuerdo con Hobsbawm (1992), la nación argentina fue el resultado de muchos procesos conflictivos en América del Sur a lo largo del Siglo XIX y no una consecuencia de la llamada Revolución de Mayo primero y, tiempo después, la Independencia. El evento denominado Revolución de Mayo puede compararse con el Boston Tea Party en los Estados Unidos. El 25 de mayo 1810 se celebró un

consejo municipal (*Cabildo Abierto*) en la ciudad de Buenos Aires, con el objetivo de discutir el vacío de poder creado por Napoleón, que para ese momento había invadido España y tomado como rehén la autoridad real de las metrópolis y las colonias españolas: Fernando VII. Del Cabildo Abierto surgió la *Primera Junta* o el primer gobierno no español, que, sin embargo, juró lealtad a la corona española. Había muchos y diferentes intereses políticos y económicos presentes en la élite política de Buenos Aires y no había un camino claramente pavimentado hacia la independencia (Lynch, 2009). La independencia de las Provincias Unidas del Sur en 1816 fue difícil de conseguir, a causa de los muchos intereses en conflicto. No hubo constitución argentina hasta 1853. Además, la configuración del territorio en 1816 y 1853 era muy diferente del actual territorio nacional.

Que el 25 de mayo 1810 en Buenos Aires haya sido una 'revolución' que marca el inicio de la independencia argentina, está íntimamente relacionado con la Historia nacional de fines de Siglo XIX escrita por Bartolomé Mitre, presidente de Argentina desde 1862 hasta 1868. Su trabajo es considerado fundacional en la historiografía argentina. Como alternativa a su 'ficción orientadora' centralista enfocada en el centro comercial y puerto de Buenos Aires y en la generación de intelectuales ilustrados, hubo otra ficción orientadora nacionalista, que se centró en la comarca agrícola productiva y en la figura del gaucho (Shumway, 1991). Estas diferentes ficciones subyacen a los debates sobre la configuración del pasado nacional, relacionados con la oposición política entre *unitarios* y *federales*, que han continuado en el Siglo XX. El *Revisionismo* fue un movimiento que primero estalló entre 1930 y 1940 a favor de una reinterpretación nacionalista de la historia, en oposición a la interpretación centralista de Mitre. Esto se reflejaba en los libros de texto de Historia (Romero, 2004) que cambiaban el énfasis entre los diferentes regímenes, centrándose más en Buenos Aires y en el comercio internacional o en Argentina en su conjunto, que todavía necesitaba independizarse del imperialismo. Sin embargo, en los libros de texto, "La nación era el principio organizativo y estructurador de todo relato o explicación del pasado [y] el interés se centraba sobre todo en el momento de constitución de la nación" (Romero, 2004, p. 41).

Hay una tradición ampliamente compartida, que toma al 25 de mayo 1810 en Buenos Aires como una revolución que, en última instancia, conduce a la independencia del 9 de julio, firmada en Tucumán en 1816. Cada año estas fechas marcan las celebraciones nacionales y los rituales patrióticos que, como se ha visto anteriormente, son elementos poderosos en el proceso de inculcar representaciones del pasado. Las celebraciones nacionales, los rituales patrióticos y los símbolos nacionales se introdujeron en las escuelas a finales del Siglo XIX, como parte de un programa para unificar y homogeneizar a la nueva población inmigrante (Bertoni, 2001). Como consecuencia de la inmigración masiva había una gran diversidad étnica, y la desintegración era

considerada una terrible amenaza del mismo modo que lo fue en Estados Unidos – de ahí el 'credo americano' (VanSledright, 2008). Junto con el fútbol, al que no hay que subestimar, estos símbolos y celebraciones nacionales han fomentado un nacionalismo argentino más allá del conflicto político interno. Los rituales y celebraciones sí cambiaron, desde ser más militaristas en la dictadura de 1976-1983, a estar casi ausentes durante los años 90, para volverse más festivos en la última década (Grimson, 2007). En el año 2010, el aniversario nacional por los 200 años de la Revolución de Mayo fue celebrado abundantemente, ilustrando que el nacimiento de la nación está claramente situado en el Cabildo Abierto de Buenos Aires el 25 de mayo 1810 y no en la declaración formal de independencia en 1816, en Tucumán. Como parte del aniversario, se inauguró un nuevo museo nacional junto a la casa de Gobierno presidencial, donde la historia nacional es contada de un modo comparativo pero *revisionista*, y comienza con la Revolución de Mayo.¹

En esta Historia nacional, la memoria colectiva sobre la dictadura militar y la pelea por los derechos humanos tomaron un lugar central.² El Ministerio de Educación ha dado forma a la incorporación de la memoria colectiva en la escuela a través del 'Programa de Educación para la memoria', que incluye material sobre la dictadura militar (1976-1983), el Holocausto durante la Segunda Guerra Mundial, y la "causa de la recuperación de las Islas Malvinas", recordando la guerra librada por la dictadura militar en 1982 por las islas Malvinas / Falklands.³ Aparte del enfoque en la memoria colectiva, la última década conoció a una tendencia política que se orientaba hacia la inclusión y la solidaridad, y un nacionalismo constructivo en términos de *la patria es el otro*. Sin embargo, esta reconstrucción de la identidad nacional incluyó debates sobre el *revisionismo* histórico nacionalista, tras la creación gubernamental del Instituto Nacional de revisionismo histórico de Argentina y Latinoamérica "Manuel Dorrego".⁴ La televisión nacional y otros medios populares de divulgación de la historia reinstalaron el valor del mito nacional (Dimeglio, 2011; Pigna, 2009). Los historiadores critican este "uso político de la historia"

¹ <http://www.museobicentenario.gob.ar/>

² La celebración nacional ahora también implica el recuerdo colectivo del *terrorismo de Estado* y de los *desaparecidos*, las personas desaparecidas durante la dictadura. Esto ocurre el 24 de marzo o el *día de la memoria*. En esta ocasión también se celebra a los movimientos de derechos humanos de las Madres y Abuelas de Plaza de Mayo, que todavía están en busca de sus hijos desaparecidos y de sus nietos. Mientras que esta celebración se ha hecho cada vez más popular, la fiesta nacional que celebra el descubrimiento de América por Colón gradualmente fue siendo abandonada y reemplazada por un día para recordar y celebrar a los pueblos originarios que sufrieron la invasión española. Sin embargo, esto depende mucho de cada área particular del país: en el sur de Argentina todavía hay una actitud hostil hacia el mapuche indígena y en el norte, en las fronteras con Chile, Bolivia, Paraguay y Brasil, Argentina resulta muy nacionalista a pesar de ser multiétnica.

³ <http://portal.educacion.gov.ar/secundaria/programas/educacion-y-memoria/>
Último acceso 29 de enero de 2015.

⁴ La Nación, 28-11-2011: Polémico instituto de revisión de la historia que busca rescatar lo "nacional y popular". <http://www.lanacion.com.ar/1427023-impulsa-el-gobierno-una-revision-de-la-historia>
Último acceso 31 de enero de 2015.

(Chiaramonte, 2013), pero su llamado a la neutralidad histórica es típicamente respondido por un llamado a la solidaridad social. Chiaramonte⁵ ha subrayado que “la historia como disciplina [...] es la que busca dejar de lado las manipulaciones políticas o ideológicas -incluidas las que puedan portar los mismos historiadores- por más bien intencionadas que ellas puedan ser, para intentar lograr un mejor conocimiento del pasado.” En este escenario particular, se investigó la representación del pasado nacional que hacen los estudiantes de la escuela secundaria. En concreto, fue analizada la manera en que se apropiaron de la narrativa de la Revolución de Mayo de 1810.

⁵ Página 12, 4-12-2011: Historia y revisionismo. Por José Carlos Chiaramonte.
<http://www.pagina12.com.ar/diario/elpais/subnotas/182655-56863-2011-12-04.html>
Último acceso 31 de enero de 2015.

OBJETIVOS PRINCIPALES

- ❖ Seguir examinando la tensión o la interacción entre la comprensión disciplinar de la Historia y la construcción de la identidad nacional,
 - Considerando las contribuciones de la historiografía, estudios en la enseñanza y el aprendizaje de la Historia, la memoria colectiva y la psicología social e, integrarlas en un enfoque sociocultural.
- ❖ Investigar la función y las características de las narrativas maestras en más detalle,
 - Considerando la narrativa maestra como una herramienta cultural en la producción y consumición de relatos históricos nacionales.
 - Considerando la relación entre la narrativa maestra, por un lado, y la comprensión de la Historia, la memoria colectiva y, la construcción de identidades, por otro.
 - Estudiando cómo éstas representaciones de la nación podrían cambiar.
- ❖ Reflexionar sobre la cuestión cómo una narrativa histórica nacional podría integrar la comprensión disciplinar de la Historia y la construcción de identidades.

OBJETIVOS Y PREGUNTAS POR CAPÍTULO⁶

1. DO MASTER NARRATIVES CHANGE AMONG HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS?
A CHARACTERIZATION OF HOW NATIONAL HISTORY IS REPRESENTED
 - Proponer un esquema general para analizar las representaciones de la Historia nacional, en base a las características de las narrativas maestras y, aplicarlo a una muestra de estudiantes Argentinos de secundaria.
 - ¿Se encuentran las características de las narrativas maestras en la representación de la Historia nacional de los estudiantes?
 - ¿Cambian las representaciones a lo largo de los años de enseñanza secundaria y, en caso que lo hagan, cómo?
 - ¿Cuán coherente o flexible son éstas representaciones?
 - ¿Cómo se relacionan éstas representaciones con la comprensión disciplinar de la Historia y la construcción de identidades?

⁶ Se ha mantenido en Inglés el título de la publicación correspondiente que contiene cada capítulo.

2. THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE RELATION BETWEEN NATIONAL PAST AND PRESENT IN THE APPROPRIATION OF HISTORICAL MASTER NARRATIVES

- Proponer tres tipos de construcciones de la relación entre pasado y presente nacional en la narrativa maestra, según los relatos de los estudiantes de secundaria y el análisis de algunos discursos presidenciales.
 - ¿Cómo se construye la relación entre pasado y presente en las representaciones que toman la forma de una narrativa maestra?
 - ¿Cómo clarifica esto la relación entre las representaciones de forma narrativa maestra, por un lado, y la comprensión disciplinar de la Historia y, la construcción de identidades nacionales, por otro?

3. IDENTITIES: NEVER THE SAME AGAIN?

- Proponer una reflexión sobre la historicidad y el cambio del concepto de identidad.
 - ¿Cómo podría un concepto de identidad o una categoría de identidad nacional contribuir a una comprensión disciplinar de la Historia?

4. THE COMPLEX CONSTRUCTION OF IDENTITY REPRESENTATIONS AND THE FUTURE OF HISTORY EDUCATION

- Proponer una reflexión sobre la relación entre la memoria colectiva, la construcción de identidades y, la comprensión disciplinar de la Historia, en la enseñanza de la Historia actual.
 - ¿Cuán compleja es dicha relación?
 - ¿Cuáles son los desafíos para la enseñanza de la Historia?

5. HISTORY, COLLECTIVE MEMORIES OR NATIONAL MEMORIES? HOW THE REPRESENTATION OF THE PAST IS FRAMED BY MASTER NARRATIVES

- Proponer la ampliación de la memoria colectiva más allá de los formatos históricos nacionales, para incluir una variedad de perspectivas y, su comparación histórica.
 - ¿Cómo pueden la historiografía y las memorias colectivas contribuir a la construcción crítica de la memoria nacional?

1.

DO MASTER NARRATIVES CHANGE AMONG HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS? A CHARACTERIZATION OF HOW NATIONAL HISTORY IS REPRESENTED⁷

ABSTRACT

Master narratives frame students' historical knowledge, possibly hindering access to more historical representations. A detailed analysis of students' historical narratives about the origins of their own nation is presented in terms of four master narrative characteristics related to the historical subject, national identification, the main theme and the nation concept. The narratives of Argentine 8th and 11th graders were analyzed to establish whether a change toward a more complex historical account occurred. The results show that the past is mostly understood in master narrative terms but in the 11th grade narratives demonstrate a more historical understanding. Only identification appears to be fairly constant across years of history learning. The results suggest that in history education first aiming at a constructivist concept of nation and then using the concept to reflect on the national historical subject and events in the narrative might help produce historical understanding of a national past.

Historical knowledge and the elaboration of narrative are intimately related. It has been suggested that narrative constitutes a particularly human way of organizing thought (Bruner, 1990). Narrative thought, which structures experience with plot, is a way of constructing reality. This can, in turn, frame the consumption or learning of history (Carretero & Kriger, 2011; Rüsen, 2004; Straub, 2005; Wertsch, 1998). History is also produced or taught as narrative. Both in philosophy of history (e.g., Ricoeur, 1990; Topolsky, 2000; White, 1987) and in history education (e.g., Barton & Levstik, 2004), narratives have been recognized as powerful cultural tools for historical understanding. The analysis of narrative as a cultural tool, encompassing their production and consumption, allows for a broad scope on historical understanding. However, history and narrative are not the same: narratives can be more and less historical. Indeed, narration can be considered a part of the craft of the historian, establishing a complex relationship between the past and the present. Therefore, narrative competence is considered necessary for developing historical consciousness (Rüsen, 2004). Yet, narrative can also simplify or obliterate what historical research reveals and thus limit historical understanding. A plot is selective and implies that some events are told, some characters are mentioned, whereas others are not. A proper use of historical sources often conflicts with creating a lively narrative, as

⁷ Co-authored with Mario Carretero and published 2014 in *Cognition and Instruction*, 32(3), 290-312.

Marguerite Yourcenar also emphasizes. Reflecting on writing the *Memoirs of Hadrian*, she says, “Whatever one does, one always rebuilds the monument in his own way. But it is already something gained to have used only the original stones” (Yourcenar, 2000, p. 248).

In education history typically acquires a narrative format (Barton, 2008), which on the one hand might facilitate learning as it engages with prior narrative thought, but on the other hand, narrative as a frame might limit understanding. The matter of what history is taught becomes most important, as it is not only the student’s narrative thought but also the selection of narratives propagated through education that frames which monuments, or accounts of the past, are (re)constructed. It is not surprising that the establishment of a history curriculum or canon drags educators and policymakers into heated debate (Grever & Stuurman, 2007; Symcox & Wilschut, 2009), because by framing the past, the future is also framed (Carretero & Solcoff, 2012).

NATIONAL HISTORICAL NARRATIVES AS A CULTURAL TOOL IN EDUCATION

One kind of narrative is encountered in most countries when history is taught: the narrative about the country’s own history (Barton & McCully, 2005; Carretero, 2011). These national historical narratives are *master narratives* that underlie superficial changes of historical contents and the variety of stories we encounter and manifest over and over in revisions of the curriculum (Alridge, 2006). The master narrative has been developed as a unit of analysis in current social scientific and historical thought. For example, Heller (2006) describes master narratives as general interpretation patterns which have the function of making sense of the past, present, and future of a cultural community. She analyzes the biblical narrative of the Jewish people looking for freedom through the exodus from Egypt as a general model of liberation from oppression. This model is supposed to act as a narrative underlying many representations of the past, particularly those related to national revolutions. Analyses of school history contents, either from a disciplinary historical perspective (Berger, 2012) or from the history education point of view (Foster, 2012), reveal their close resemblance to “official narratives” aiming at historically legitimizing the present and future political agenda. How students understand and analyze the past is greatly influenced by these kinds of pervading narratives (VanSledright, 2008). As Alridge (2006) indicated:

American history textbooks present discrete, heroic, one dimensional, and neatly packaged master narratives that deny students a complex, realistic, and rich understanding of people and events in American history. . . . Such master narratives, I contend, permeate most history textbooks and deny students critical lenses through which to examine, analyze, and interpret social issues today. (p. 663)

As a consequence of the emphasis on national master narratives, students have limited access to what's controversial about the history of their country, thus complicating the development of a critical perspective (Grever & Stuurman, 2007; Penuel & Wertsch, 2000). According to Wertsch (1998, 2002; Wertsch & Rozin, 2000), national historical narratives are cultural tools configuring how the past is represented and understood.

The notion of cultural tool indicates that certain objectives underlie the selection and content of narratives. Seixas (2004, p. 5) states synthetically that “a common past [is] perhaps the crucial instrument—in the construction of collective identities in the present” (see also Seixas, 2012). Many scholars agree that through history education values are transmitted and identities are constructed (Barton & Levstik, 2008; Hobsbawm, 1992). Particularly national identity construction has been aimed at for many years (Carretero, 2011). History education emerged at the end of the nineteenth century with the specific purpose of consolidating national identity and constructing nation-states (Berger, 2012). National historical narratives have been criticized in historiography, and this criticism found its way to educational practice, which, for example, then began emphasizing the learning of critical historical skills (Symcox & Wilschut, 2009). Yet, studies reveal that current curricula and textbooks have a nationalist foundation (Foster & Crawford, 2006; van der Leeuw-Roord, 2004). Carretero (2011) suggests that two different objectives of history education have been handed down, aiming at identity construction on the one hand and critical historical thinking on the other. Barton (2008) and Gottlieb and Wineburg (2012) also implicitly and explicitly consider the existence of different objectives of history education. The continuous tension between the identity-formation function and the critical function of history education is elaborated and discussed by Carretero, Asensio, and Rodriguez-Moneo (2012) as well. In the construction of the national historical narrative by students, deep contradictions appear between identification on the one hand and critical reflection on the other (Carretero & Kriger, 2011). This invites further study on whether the two objectives of history education are complementary, as will be discussed later on.

NATIONAL HISTORICAL NARRATIVES AS A CULTURAL TOOL IN LEARNING HISTORY

National master narratives have been primarily studied in the context of their production, that is, in history textbooks and in other cultural devices related to the public uses of history (Alridge, 2006; Foster & Crawford, 2006; VanSledright, 2008). Much less work has been done on how exactly students “consume” master narratives (Wertsch & Rozin, 2000). Yet it is important to consider that learning or consumption is more than a passive reproduction of the produced educational content. Processes of resistance, expressed by counternarratives, have also been found to occur (Wertsch, 1998). Both production and consumption of master narratives and

their interaction need to be well understood. Are the produced master narratives also consumed and how? Research has affirmed that overall the historical narratives that students construct about their own nation closely resemble historical master narratives (Barton, 2008; Lopez, Carretero & Rodriguez-Moneo, 2014a; Wertsch, 2002). To study this in more detail, a model of production and consumption of national historical narratives has been proposed (see for more details Carretero, 2011, Chapter 4; Carretero & Bermudez, 2012). Four characteristics of historical master narratives distinguished in that model will be under consideration in this article:

1. The historical subject is established in terms of inclusion and exclusion, radically opposing it to others as a coherent and homogeneous group. This determines the “voice” of the narrative and the exclusion of others, as well as the logical course of action for the subject often confronting the historical other. The national group is internally unified, and at the same time, it is set apart as absolutely different from another, often simplified, historical group.
2. Identification processes are at work in the narrative, attaching personal affect and value judgments to the unification and opposition mentioned above. The historical subject is referred to in the first person plural “us,” often logically opposed to “them,” and valued more positively. A shared identity—a timeless national identity—between the present storyteller and the past historical subject is established.
3. The historical events are simplified around one common narrative theme, such as the search for freedom or territory. As indicated by previous studies (e.g., Wertsch, 1998), this search only considers the freedom of a specific group: the freedom of the historical subject. The narrative tends to minimize, and avoids mentioning, the right to freedom of additional subjects, such as natives, slaves, or women. Also, this particular freedom is considered in a teleological way, as the pre-established outcome of the historical processes.
4. The narrative demonstrates a romantic and essentialist concept of both the nation and its nationals. The national identity is perceived as a natural property and a condition preexisting the nation. This narrative characteristic is based on our recent theoretical (Carretero, Castorina, & Levinas, 2013) and empirical (Lopez et al., 2014a) contributions, developing the idea that concepts and narratives interact in the students’ historical representations. Concepts are supposed to be embedded in the narrative, and it is important to pay attention to their analysis, because different ways of using concepts could affect how the students construct their representations of the past.

From the perspective of contemporary historiography, the kind of historical narrative characterized here is inadequate. It provides a presentist or anachronist view on national history. It projects present categories on the past and confounds historical cause and effect. National identity is taken as a precondition of the historical events instead of taking it as a result that is historically constructed. As Hobsbawm observes, "Defining a nation by its members' consciousness of belonging to it is tautological and only provides an a posteriori guide to what a nation is" (1992, pp. 7-8). National identities are not real or natural conditions, but constructions of political interest (Gellner, 1978). The nation is an imagined community (Anderson, 1983), or at least it is a modern social construct (Hobsbawm, 1992; Smith, 2002). The narrative driven by an essentialist or naturalized concept of nation and national identity, with its univocal and transcendent historical subject taking a logical and just course of action, is a particularly mythical approach to the past. It is also a biased approach, as the narrative aims at legitimizing national identity historically and thus attributes interests to the past instead of trying to understand the past in its own terms.

This is of great importance for learning history, suggesting that critical historical understanding means overcoming a biased conceptualization and simplified narrative of nation (Carretero et al., 2013). Research about history learning indicates that students only modestly progress in historical understanding. For example, learning to think historically has been found to be difficult for students because presentism limits them in developing a more disciplinary historical approach toward the past (Wineburg, 2001). Also, tensions occur between identification with and taking a distance from the national past as sources of historical reflection (Carretero & Kriger, 2011; Goldberg, 2013). When it comes to historical concepts, students do progress from a more concrete understanding to a more abstract understanding (Berti & Andriolo, 2001; Carretero & Lee, 2014). Nevertheless, students master the second-order concepts that are necessary for dealing with historical source material and interpretations contradicting each other relatively late (Lee & Ashby, 2000). Young students tend to use concrete, anecdotal and personalist causal explanations rather than abstract and structural causal explanations (Carretero, Lopez-Manjon & Jacott, 1997). Understanding the complexity of historical events varies throughout adolescence and adulthood, yet historical representation remains static and simple rather than becoming dynamic and complex (Voss & Carretero, 2000). When it comes to historical narratives, students' meta-understanding develops from taking the historical account as a given (the past is the story), through taking them as copies of the past with accidental errors or deliberate distortion, to interpretations of historians with particular questions (Lee & Ashby, 2000). Yet, when looking at the narrative accounts produced by adult students, even they lacked in historical understanding while reproducing national historical narratives (Carretero, Lopez, Gonzalez & Rodriguez-Moneo, 2012; Lopez et al., 2014a).

Elaborating on this research tradition and applying the model of four master narrative characteristics, this article will consider how students represent their national historical narrative and whether they progress from a master narrative to a more historical account of the national past. As it has been introduced, our approach considers the importance of two possible influences on the student's representation. On the one hand, we suppose there is an influence of the master narrative. On the other hand, we assume there is a progression from simple to complex representation of history. We suppose this expected progression could be due to the combined impact of cognitive development, enriched history learning, and an increasing exposure to cultural accounts through media and socialization devices.

Before presenting our study on students' reconstructions of the national past, the particular master narrative under consideration will be introduced. Even though national historical narratives are common worldwide and share characteristics, cultural tools are known to be context-specific. In order to properly contextualize the study carried out in Argentina, and to understand the qualitative results presented later on, the relevant Argentine history will be briefly reviewed. As will be seen, the four master narrative characteristics are contested by historical research.

A MYTH OF ORIGIN UNDER HISTORICAL SCRUTINY

Classical studies of nationalism (Smith, 1991) have stated that every nation has a myth of origin. That is, an event presented as the starting point of the nation. A myth of origin is a classical example of a national historical master narrative. In the case of Argentina, this is May 25, 1810, representing the revolution leading to independence from Spain (Romero, 2004; Shumway, 1991). The event can be compared to the Boston Tea Party in the United States and other histories of independence on the American continent, whose narrative structures are strikingly similar.

In Argentina, May 25 is celebrated every year as a day of independence. Children are exposed early on. Witnessing and performing patriotic acts is mandatory both in private and public primary schools. The official date of independence is July 9, 1816, six years after the events in 1810. July 9 is also a national holiday and celebrated in schools. As studied by Bertoni (2001), these celebrations were invented about 40 years after the first constitution and approximately 80 years after independence. This was primarily motivated by the growing number of immigrants importing different celebrations from their countries of origin and the perceived need to bring all different groups and customs together. In other words, the main objective of implementing the patriotic school acts was to foster social cohesion and national identity.

Additionally, the celebration of the 200-year anniversary of the nation in 2010 indicates that May 25 collectively represents the origin of the nation.

Apart from the informal teaching through rituals, celebrations, and other means of collective memory, national history is taught formally in school. The curriculum contents are basic and simple in primary school, becoming more complex in high school. Officially May 25 is on the high school curriculum at the end of the second year (ninth grade). Practically, at the school where this research was carried out, May 25 is taught at the beginning of the third year (10th grade) as a part of the history of the processes of independence. The events are presented in the wider context of the French Revolution, the processes of independence in Northern America, and in the narrower context of the English invasions in Buenos Aires just prior to 1810.

Historical investigation reveals that neither Argentina nor the Argentines existed yet in 1810. In the Viceroyalty of River Plate, indirectly ruled by the Spanish monarch Ferdinand VII, different political identities existed (Chiaramonte, 1989). To suppose that Argentine nationalism led to independence is an anachronism, misreading the *criollo* sentiments some might have had at the time (Chiaramonte, 1991). Criollo refers to the Spanish colonists and their descendants but also to local cultural identities different from Spain as a consequence of mixing with Native Americans (Shumway, 1991). They did not form a homogeneous or unanimous group. What happened in 1810 involved a quarreling political elite and cannot be indisputably categorized as a political action toward independence. This would be a teleological interpretation of what at the time were tensions between colony and metropolis. Also, very diverse political projects, from a new monarchy to a radical Jacobin republic, existed among the May 25 political leaders (Lynch, 2009). What actually happened was a *Cabildo Abierto*, an expanded town council meeting in the city of Buenos Aires. The cabildos were political institutions of the colonial period with a council consisting of elects from the local elite under jurisdiction of the viceroy (Shumway, 1991). Out of the meeting on May 25, 1810 came the *Primera Junta*. This was the first governing body not to represent Spain, which nevertheless swore allegiance to Ferdinand VII. Independence was formally declared in 1816, and the first constitution was established in 1853, but even then, Argentina as a nation, territory, and identity was not consolidated. Therefore, in response to the four master narrative characteristics listed above, by 1810:

1. There was no homogeneous national historical subject.
2. National identification was formed by the social and political changes over several decades.
3. There was no one common objective of independence.
4. There was no Argentina nor were there Argentines.

In short, the Argentine national historical narrative is a cultural tool with certain characteristics that are contested by historical research, just like other national historical narratives are. Whether the aforementioned master narrative characteristics appear in the national historical narrative told by students and whether a more disciplinary historical account of the past is approached will now be further explored.

OBJECTIVES

The objective of this study was to analyze the narrative that Argentine high school students construct about May 25, 1810, in terms of the four characteristics establishing the historical subject, identification, the main historical events, and the conceptualization of nation. This study also analyzes whether there are differences in these narratives between two groups: 8th and 11th graders. It aims at exploring whether the students' narratives reflect the master narrative characteristics and whether these change towards more historically sophisticated representations. Additionally, if this change occurs, this study seeks to establish which specific narrative features this change is affecting. Even though this article deals with the master narrative of a specific nation, it also aims at providing a scheme of analysis based on the four mentioned characteristics that could be applied to master narratives in other countries, for example, on the American continent. This is clarified by Table 1, which illustrates the analytic strategy.

METHOD

Participants

In this study, 38 Argentinean students participated, 18 male and 20 female, from an urban, middle class, public high school in Buenos Aires. Among them were 18 8th graders (age: $M = 13.3$; $SD = 0.77$) and 20 11th graders (age: $M = 16.2$; $SD = 0.52$). The researchers approached the school as it reflects the middle socioeconomic segment of the population. Considering the school's reputation, its situation in the city, and the professional profile of the students' parents, the students have above average access to cultural resources. The students were selected at random after parent consent forms, which informed about the aims of the research in very broad terms, had been handed back. The sample is best defined in terms of the students' Argentine nationality; the sample represents the wider population in which there is a mix of ethnic backgrounds both due to the colonial period and to the early twentieth century immigration from Europe. The narratives of two students, who identified themselves as Bolivian and part Brazilian respectively, were taken out of the analysis.

As has been indicated in the introduction, the 8th graders are familiar with May 25 through collective memory, the patriotic celebration carried out in primary school every year, and the basic Argentine national history on the primary school curriculum. The 11th graders had been exposed to the events in more historical detail at the beginning of their third year (10th grade) in high school. That is to say, May 25 was taught about a year before the students were interviewed. The history textbooks that are used present historically rich material, as historians were involved in their production (Cristofori, 2010; Giordano, 2012). The high school curriculum prescribes two obligatory history classes per week, a total of 2 hours and 40 minutes, from the 8th to the 12th grade. The social and cultural prestige that history enjoys in Argentina is reflected in this emphasis on history throughout high school. No particular history teaching intervention program was being implemented at this school at the time of the study.

Procedure

Semistructured individual interviews were conducted to obtain the students' narratives. School personnel called the students during regular classes to the empty classroom where the interviews took place. The interviewer would introduce herself as an investigator interested in what students thought about certain historical events, assuring that their identities were confidential and that the interview did not have an evaluative purpose. After the subjects had given their consent, the interview was recorded. A picture, often encountered in Argentine history textbooks, was used to trigger the narrative. It is a picture of a crowd in front of the emblematic Cabildo, representing the May 25 events. The subjects were first asked to elaborate on what was happening in the picture. The first part of the interview aimed at their spontaneous production of a narrative about May 25. The interviewer did not mention historical terms, like *cabildo*, *revolution*, or *independence*, if the subject had not mentioned them first. If necessary, in order to invite the students to further elaborate their representation, they were asked

- What had happened;
- How it had happened;
- Why it had happened;
- For what reasons it had happened;
- Who had participated in these events;
- Why they had participated in the events; and
- To what purpose they had participated in the events.

In the second part of the interview, specific questions were asked to have the students reflect on the historical subject and events they had described. Thus, the interviewer aimed at the participants' further elaboration of their explanations and concepts. A series of questions about

the historical subject and context, starting with “Were they Argentines?,” was employed. In order to verify whether the subject would insist in representing the past in master narrative terms, some questions were posed offering the subject a more historical alternative (“Some people say they were Spanish colonists or criollos, what do you think?”). This clinical–critical interview strategy aimed at establishing the subject’s nation concept and had been successfully used in earlier research (Carretero & Gonzalez, 2008; Gonzalez & Carretero, 2013). Corresponding to the clinical–critical interview method (Duveen & Gilligan, 2013), both the standard interview questions and what the student would spontaneously say guided the interviewer.

Analytic Strategy

A comparative strategy was used to analyze the assembled narratives on four dimensions that would, on the one hand, reflect the national master narrative characteristics mentioned above and on the other, the more historical alternative. Identification as a characteristic was determined by the students’ use of *us*, *we*, or *our* in the past tense, that is, when narrating about the May 25 historical subject. The alternative would be using *them*, *they*, or *their* in describing these protagonists. The use of these terms was counted in the first part of the interview, when the student would speak more spontaneously about the historical event. The coding depended on whether in this initial phase the students mostly used the first person plural or the third person plural.

The other three characteristics and their historical alternatives are summarized in Table 1 in terms of criteria for analyzing the narrative. The first column indicates the more general criteria that can also be applied to narratives in other countries. The second column gives more specific criteria as they apply to the Argentine historical narrative. The analysis would thus indicate whether the subject of the historical narrative was homogeneous or heterogeneous. This is to say, the analysis would reveal whether the subject of the historical narrative was simplified and idealized as in the traditional master narrative or diversified and contextualized socially and politically according to contemporary historical accounts. Likewise, the narration of the historical event would be established as simple or complex. That is, it would be determined whether the historical event was explained as a monocausal ideological quest for freedom and independence or in terms of the complex and conflict-laden political and social circumstances of the time, as a multicausal account. The coding with respect to the historical subject and events was based on the first part of the interview, in which students elaborated or were asked to elaborate on what happened. If they demonstrated different ideas later in the interview, it was established whether this was due to a real complex understanding of the past, or merely to doubt induced by the interviewer’s suggestions, and weighed with the first part of the interview.

Finally, the understanding of the nation concept demonstrated in the narrative was analyzed to be essential and everlasting or historically constructed. Did the events happen in Argentina, and were the protagonists Argentines, or was it in the Viceroyalty of the River Plate involving colonists with political privileges? This decision was based on weighing the first part with the second part of the interview, depending on how the students reacted to the interviewer's suggestions.

TABLE 1
Criteria for Narrative Characterization

	<i>General criteria</i>	<i>Specific indication</i>
<i>Historical subject</i>		
Homogeneous	Historical subject described as an unanimous group / internal identification and unification	The “(Argentinean) people”
	Rigorous separation of historical subject from historical other	The Spaniards merely as “them”: opponents of the revolution
Heterogeneous	Presence of different or conflictive motives within group of historical subjects	Different ideologies among <i>criollos</i>
	Historical subject and historical other not absolutely separated	Revolutionaries were Spanish colonists
<i>Historical events</i>		
Simple	The event as a sudden and uniform change	25 th of May 1810 means Independence
	Search for freedom as basic theme or telos, not considering other (economic, social, political or international) factors	Liberation from the Spaniards
Complex	Acknowledgement of gradual change and conflictive process	<i>Cabildo Abierto</i> part of long political process with internal power struggles
	Taking diverse, social, political, economic and international factors into account	Some wanting to get rid of the economic monopoly, some wanting political autonomy
<i>Nation concept</i>		
Essentialist	Preexistence of the nation	Argentina before or at the time of May 25 th 1810
	Preexistence of the nationals	Argentines before or at the time of May 25 th 1810
Constructivist	The nation is the result of a historical process	Argentina gradually constructed / in 1853 the first constitution
	Change in names for the territory	Viceroyalty of River Plate at the moment of the <i>Cabildo</i>
	Nationals as a constructed group	No Argentines until much later

In order to validate the analysis, two independent judges analyzed the narratives from a random 30% of the total sample. The agreement index surpassed 94.5% in all cases. The discrepancies found were used to reflect on and further elaborate the narrative characteristics. We were interested in analyzing the differences between 8th graders and 11th graders in detail per narrative element. The appropriate nonparametric statistics were used to compare them: a χ^2 test when the cross tabulation cell values counted more than 5, Fischer's Exact Test if values were lower than 5 (Siegel & Castellan, 1988).

RESULTS

The length of the interviews averaged 26 minutes ($SD = 7.5$) for the 8th graders and 27 minutes for the 11th graders ($SD = 6.1$). There is, however, a significant difference in the amount of words uttered in the entire interview between the 8th graders ($M = 1312$; $SD = 978$) and the 11th graders ($M = 2151$; $SD = 810$); $t(36) = -2.89$, $p < .01$. Indeed, the 8th graders needed to be questioned more for the interviewer to have a proper idea about their narrative representation. They often knew more than they spontaneously stated. These first statements could be as concise as "It was when we liberated ourselves from the Spaniards, very important, with the 200-year anniversary and all." Through the interviewer's questions, these initial mini-narratives could be elaborated. All the students recognized the picture and knew what it collectively represented, in terms of revolution or independence.

Below the results per narrative element will be presented first, illustrated with interview excerpts from both groups. All names reported in the interview fragments are pseudonyms. Second, the narrative patterns and the relation between narrative elements found will be presented.

THE HISTORICAL SUBJECT: HOMOGENEOUS OR HETEROGENEOUS?

As Table 2 indicates, 89% of the 8th graders represent the historical subject as homogeneous, and there's a decrease in the 11th grade (50%). The following fragments illustrate a homogeneous historical subject:

Interviewer: What can you tell me about this Revolution?

Mario (13 years old): The Argentine people were tired of being governed by Spain. At that time there was a Viceroy and the people went to overthrow him, to tell him that we were free people.

TABLE 2
Historical Subject of the Narrative per Grade Level

	<i>8th Grade</i>	<i>11th Grade</i>	<i>Total</i>
Historical subject			
Homogeneous	89%	50%	26
Heterogeneous	11%	50%	12
<i>n</i>	18	20	38

Interviewer: Are you saying that there were also Argentines that did not want to become independent?

Violeta (16 years old): [. . . T]here was a group that maybe did not want to, that wanted to maintain the same ideology. And then, almost the big majority . . . the people let's say, wanted independence.

[. . .]

Interviewer: There are people who think that they were Spanish colonists or *criollos*. What do you think?

Violeta: I think it's the same [. . .]. It was mostly the purpose of what they were doing, [. .] they were striving all together for the same purpose.

In the fragment of the interview with Mario, “the people” and “we,” presented in opposition to Spain, indicated a homogeneous historical subject. Violeta considers the possibility of opposite groups within the territory but rejects it, unifying the historical subject as “the people” with a common interest.

A heterogeneous historical subject was encountered in 50% of the accounts of 11th graders, compared to 11% in the 8th grade. For example:

Interviewer: Who were the people that participated on the 25th of May?

Alex (13 years old): The majority were [. . .] what is called peninsular criollos [. . .]. Because the majority was of Spanish origin. Some were born here and others were not, like Matheu who was a Spanish merchant that came here, and Saavedra, who today would be Bolivian as he was born in what was Upper Peru. We can't say they were all Argentines; there were Spaniards, peninsular criollos.[. . .] The [other] criollos and lower [classes] were not admitted, because they were not considered citizens in deciding on different matters.

Interviewer: Why, what happened?

Soledad (16 years old):We ceased to belong to Spain. I don't know to what degree it was

democratic, because not everyone voted in the Primera Junta . . . the people were not well represented. [. . .]

Interviewer: Who participated?

Soledad: The elite in my opinion. They controlled everything and were the first to propose the matter of the revolution, freeing us from Spain.

Alex and Soledad distinguish between different sociopolitical groups present at the time of the historical event. There were criollos with and without privileges, and not all people were allowed to participate. Alex also indicates the Spanish origin of the majority of the revolutionaries. In her account, Soledad describes the historical subject in terms of oppositions or conflicts, even though she uses “us” in her description of the past.

To sum up, the majority of narratives was characterized by a homogeneous historical subject, as a sort of idealized (pre)national community. This occurred significantly more in the accounts constructed by 8th graders (Fisher’s $p < .05$), indicating that in the 11th grade, students have a more contextualized understanding of those participating on May 25, 1810.

IDENTIFICATION

The first person plural was used in the past tense in 61% of the narratives, with no significant difference between 8th graders and 11th graders, $\chi^2 (1, N = 38) = 0.354, p = .55$. Consider, for instance, the next two examples of an 11th grader using *we* and an 8th grader using *they* in their description of the May 25 historical subject.

Interviewer: What happened at the Cabildo?

Cristina (16 years old): In the Revolution? [. . .] a revolution arose because, as we were dominated by Spain and they had a crisis or something, we felt more . . . like we wanted to be independent [. . .] our first patriot government arises through this idea, we believed that we should not be governed by Spain [. . .] They controlled us in everything, we were a colony and worked for them.

TABLE 3
Identification in the Narrative per Grade Level

	<i>8th Grade</i>	<i>11th Grade</i>	<i>Total</i>
Identification			
‘Us’	56%	65%	23
‘Them’	44%	35%	15
<i>n</i>	18	20	38

Interviewer: What was the May Revolution?

Lucía (13 years old): When they wanted to become independent from Spain.

Interviewer: Why? They weren't independent before?

Lucía: No, Spain was . . . a representative of the king was here and so they wanted to be just Argentina, and that there'd be no people from other places and so they wanted them, like, to go.

Interviewer: And that's why they revolted . . .

Lucía: Of course, to tell the king that he should go, that they did not want him here.

Interviewer: And how did they do that?

Lucía: They went to protest at the Cabildo so that they'd listen and make the revolution happen, so that the representative of the king would go.

Cristina tells a story of repression and domination in terms of *us* and *them*. Her historical subject is timeless, uniting those in the past with herself and probably others in the present. This collective voice emphasizing colonization seems to position her as a Latin American in opposition to Spain. Lucía, on the other hand, tells a story about *them*, keeping the past and the present apart.

The percentages in Table 3 suggest that the majority of the students interviewed somehow confused past and present collective agency. The past and present are united under one national identity, whereas historically the relationship between past and present is infinitely more dynamic and complex than this national historical sameness supposes. The persistence of this characteristic throughout adolescence could indicate the pervasiveness of the master narrative cultural tool beyond formal education, in relation to its function of generating national identity.

THE HISTORICAL EVENTS: SIMPLE OR COMPLEX?

As Table 4 indicates, 89% of the narratives in the 8th grade are characterized by a simplification of the historical events, compared to 40% in the 11th grade.

TABLE 4
Historical Events of the Narrative per Grade Level

	<i>8th Grade</i>	<i>11th Grade</i>	<i>Total</i>
Historical Events			
Simple	89%	40%	24
Complex	11%	60%	14
<i>n</i>	18	20	38

The following fragments illustrate this characteristic:

Interviewer: You were saying something about freedom. What does that have to do with the May Revolution?

Laura (13 years old): That the people were seeking to be free, so it's like, how to put it . . . they gave themselves the freedom to start to express what was bothering them.

Interviewer: What was bothering them?

Laura: Not being free. [. . .]

Interviewer: Free from whom, from what?

Laura: From the government. They wanted to have their own patriotic government. [. . .]

Interviewer: Why? What do you mean by patriotic government?

Laura: Something to do with the cockade [*escarapela*, a symbol of the Argentine nation] . . . that they wanted to be . . . they wanted to depend on themselves, on their own people and not on other countries. [. . .] they wanted to be Argentines because of this whole matter of . . . they didn't have the freedom to be able to be who they were.

Diego (16 years old): The people organized themselves and decided to be independent from the ruling Viceroyalty.

Interviewer: Why?

Diego: Because they felt that they were already able to be independent, they did not want to be dominated by anyone, that's probably why. [. . .]

Interviewer: There were benefits in becoming independent, is that what you're saying?

Diego: The benefit is to be able to do what they wanted. [. . .] if I think about it from an economic

perspective maybe it wasn't that good, [. . .] but freedom is freedom all the same.

Laura explains the events in terms of liberation: they became independent because they wanted to be free. This circular argumentation is found in many accounts indicating mono causality. Diego, for a moment, considers economic motives for becoming independent but then discards them. He reasons that becoming independent would not have been economically beneficial and finally boils it all down to a need to be free.

In 11% of the 8th graders and 60% of the 11th graders, the narrative is characterized by more complexity, as illustrated below:

Interviewer: What were they looking for on the 25th of May? What were they doing it for?

Alex (13 years old): [. . .] They needed to have economic independence from the monopoly, as it was for the upper class. That's why many of them supported [the

revolutionaries], because it benefited them economically. It is told that the upper class families said 'Yes to the Primera Junta, no to independence' because they wanted the Primera Junta, because it was a more indirect government and they could have a more fluent economy. But independence did not benefit them, as they would have to take care of things on their own.

Interviewer: Why a revolution?

Lucas (16 years old): [. . .] They also became independent for free trade, because everything that Argentina made had to be given to them. I believe one could say that in social terms they were seeking freedom. Even though it was not exactly like that, because until for example the obligatory vote arrived a lot of time had to pass, until women voted a lot of time passed. Even for there to be no more slavery a lot of time passed. [. . .] For the political part it was to start having their own policies and not depend on . . . let's say to have a democracy, and not depend on the crown. [. . .] Still, until they accomplished what they had proposed time went by. It's not like on the 25th of May a new system was installed and people voted for the first time, no. There was a long period of time until everything would be set up, like it is today.

Alex mentions the economic interests of the upper class, for whom independence was not that high on the agenda. Thus, he clarifies that the ideology of liberation was not shared by all and indicates the conflictive political processes at work. Lucas mentions commercial and political interests, complicates the notions of freedom and independence, and describes a long historical process. Both demonstrate a use of abstract historical concepts and a multicausal representation of past events.

In summary, a high percentage of the narratives were characterized by simplification in both age groups. However, the percentage is significantly higher in 8th graders (Fisher's $p < .01$). Among 11th graders, a higher percentage of narratives were characterized by a complexity of the events.

THE NATION: ESSENTIAL OR CONSTRUCTED?

Another difference is found with respect to the nation concept, as can be seen in Table 5. Of the narratives by 8th graders, 67% demonstrated an essentialist nation concept, as opposed to 25% in the 11th grade. The following fragments illustrate this concept:

Interviewer: Were they Argentines or Spanish colonists or *criollos*, or is it all the same, what would you say?

Maria (13 years old): People are all equal but those who are Argentines are from here and

the Spaniards are from over there. [. . .]

Interviewer: What became independent?

Maria: The whole of Argentina became independent. [. . .]

Interviewer: Because some people say that the United Provinces of the South became independent, what do you think [. . .] would you rather say that Argentina became independent?

Maria: Not only the United Provinces of the South but all the provinces became independent.

TABLE 5
Nation Concept in the Narrative per Grade Level

	<i>8th Grade</i>	<i>11th Grade</i>	<i>Total</i>
Nation Concept			
Essentialist	67%	25%	17
Constructivist	33%	75%	21
<i>n</i>	18	20	38

Interviewer: Some people think that they were Spanish colonists or *criollos*, what do you think?

Clara (16 years old): Let's see . . . the fact that they were born in Argentina, there they grabbed on to the homeland and said 'this is my homeland.' But it's also kind of a double nationality. They were born there but their parents were from Spain, they were educated there, they weren't from here [. . .] After their formation they came here to Argentina and then they realized that they were following the orders of the Spaniards and decided to end this. [. . .] They fought with their rights, saying that we didn't need a government telling us what to do, if we want to be independent, we want to govern, we the Argentines. [. . .]

Interviewer: Was it Argentina that became independent?

Clara: Yes, because of San Martín [national hero of the independence].

Maria applies the terms Argentines and Argentina indiscriminately on the pre-Argentine historical context of the May 25 events. Even back then, if they were from "here," they were Argentines. The interviewer's mention of the colonists does not make her reconsider. Maria confuses the United Provinces of the South, as the independent territory was called, with the provinces of Argentina. She reaffirms that it was the whole of Argentina that became independent. Clara also presupposes Argentina: Spanish colonists would come to Argentina and adopt some kind of double nationality, as if the Argentine nationality already existed. She also presupposes a national identity: the (self-declared) Argentines fought for their (adopted)

fatherland. So did San Martín, who at the time collaborated in the independence of Latin America, but according to Clara was a national hero responsible for Argentine independence.

Nevertheless, the misconception seems to diminish over the three high school years. Whereas 33% of 8th graders demonstrate a notion of the nation as constructed, 75% of 11th graders do. Take, for example, Juan and Amalia:

Interviewer: Did they feel Argentine?

Juan (13 years old): No, because they had the Spaniards over here. Maybe they were born in the Argentine territory, what now is Argentina, but at that time it was a part of America that was conquered by the Spaniards. They wanted to be free, not Argentines, free. Later it was called Argentina.

Interviewer: Were they Argentines like Argentines today?

Amalia (16 years old): No, I don't think so . . . today we have a constitution [. . .] It wasn't possible to talk about Argentina at that time, we weren't even a confederation, we were a viceroyalty formed by various countries.

Both students know that Argentina became established later, and therefore, the participants in the May 25 events could not have been Argentine. According to Juan, it was the quest for liberty instead of nationality that united the protagonists. Amalia uses *us* in past tense, but she demonstrates a nonessentialist take on nation.

With respect to the nation concept, the 11th graders' narratives are much less essentialist than those of 8th graders, even significantly so: $\chi^2(1, N = 38) = 6.653, p < .05$. As will be further discussed below, there seems to be little resistance to accepting a constructed nation concept. Compared to the historical subject and events, the percentages indicating a master narrative characteristic are lower for the nation concept.

NARRATIVE PATTERNS

The interview fragments considered above already give an idea of the variety and richness of the narratives and of their change through adolescence. There are a variety of narrative configurations that go beyond dichotomizing the adolescent account as either a national historical master narrative or as its more historically sophisticated counterpart. A look at the narrative patterns might clarify how master narrative reproduction changes to historical reflection or how they occur together.

As Table 6 illustrates, the more historical accounts are almost exclusively encountered among 11th graders. Only 6% of the 8th graders, that is, one student, demonstrated a predominantly

TABLE 6
Narrative Patterns

<i>Pattern of Narrative Characteristics</i>				<i>Amount of Narratives with Particular Pattern</i>		
<i>Historical Subject</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Historical Events</i>	<i>Nation concept</i>	<i>8th Grade</i>	<i>11th Grade</i>	<i>Total</i>
1	1	1	1	4	3	7
1	0	1	1	8	1	9
1	1	1	0	3	0	3
1	1	0	1	0	1	1
Narratives with mostly master narrative characteristics				83%	25%	53%
1	0	1	0	0	2	2
0	1	1	0	1	2	3
1	1	0	0	1	3	4
Half master narrative half historical elements				11%	35%	24%
0	1	0	0	1	4	5
0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Narratives with mostly historical elements				6%	40%	24%
<i>n</i>				18	20	38
				100%	100%	100%

Note. 1 = Master Narrative Characteristic. 0 = Element of Historical Account.

historical understanding, whereas 40% of the 11th graders did. The narratives wherein national historical master narrative characteristics predominate are found among 83% of the 8th graders and 25% of the 11th graders. An equal amount of historical account and master narrative characteristics occurs in the interviews with 8th graders (11%) as well as 11th graders (35%). The table suggests that in these cases, the constructivist nation concept is the historical content most often and perhaps most easily appropriated. The narrative by Germán (13) provides an illustration of what might be going on. It presents a homogeneous historical subject, identification through *us*, simplified historical events, but a nation concept that is not entirely essentialist. In the following fragment we see a tension between the nation concept and the homogeneous historical subject in simplified historical action:

Interviewer: Did they feel Argentine at that time?

Germán (13 years old): Of course, although . . . no! If Argentina did not exist at the time, or did it?

Interviewer: What do you say?

Germán: It didn't exist as Argentina. It wasn't "Argentina" Argentina.

Interviewer: What was it?

Germán: I don't know, it was "something united" of the River Plate, something like that.

Interviewer: Is that why they felt like Argentines different from how they feel nowadays?
Or did they feel Argentine the same way as nowadays?

Germán: Yes definitely, they felt the same. Before being Argentina they felt like their own people, they fought exactly for that reason, so that it could be their own and not the Spaniards'.

Interviewer: Was that feeling necessary for wanting a revolution?

Germán: Yes, otherwise the Spaniards would have stayed ruling everything and that would be that.

Interviewer: Did they feel Argentines or another kind of people?

Germán: Argentines.

Germán knows that Argentina did not yet exist and that therefore the historical subject could not have been Argentine. He is not entirely sure, however, and he sustains the unanimity of the protagonists and the singular motive for the historical events. Germán seems to think that if all the people wanted to be free from the Spaniards, they needed to have something in common. The nation did not exist yet, but something un-Spanish, like an Argentine national identity, must have existed. How else could they have organized to fight off Spanish domination? For Germán, there seems to be no problem in sustaining the existence of a national identity before there was a nation. His teleological explanation reflects that of the national historical master narrative. In this fragment, we also see how Germán's nation concept is ambiguous: He accepts that the label *Argentina* did not exist but maintains some sort of national predetermination. It seems that historicizing the national identity is more difficult than historicizing the nation. This might be an indication of a learning process that is going on.

Taking another look at Table 6, we find that much of the diversity of narrative patterns is related to the identification narrative characteristic. The 1011 and 0100 narrative patterns indicate that some students with an overall historical account would use *us*, whereas others basically telling the national master narrative would not use it at all. As also can be seen in the table, this happened in 14 of the 38 narratives, or 37%, regardless of the students' grade, $\chi^2(1, N = 38) = 2.545, p = .11$, and in over half of the narratives that were not entirely coherent. Further statistical analysis demonstrates that identification is unrelated to the other three characteristics. The homogeneous historical subject, the simple account of the events, and the essentialist nation concept are all significantly related among each other: Fisher's $p < .01$ for each of the three relations between these characteristics, as can be expected in a coherent narrative. However, the use of *us* and the homogeneous historical subject are not significantly related (Fisher's $p = .73$), nor is referring to *us* related to a simplified account of the historical events (Fisher's $p = .33$) or

to an essentialist nation concept, $\chi^2(1, N = 38) = 2.335, p = .13$. This dissociation found between identification and the other three narrative characteristics is reflected in the narrative patterns: the coexistence of more historical information and the use of *us* in the past tense on the one hand, and the coexistence of a master narrative and a lack of the identification narrative characteristic on the other. This coexistence could be an effect of the different goals of history education, identity construction and disciplinary historical thinking, which were mentioned in the introduction. However, whether identification enters in tension with the development of historical understanding is a question that carries beyond these results. The results do seem to suggest that aiming at identity construction could be compatible with aiming at critical historical understanding. This is a matter in need of further research.

DISCUSSION

Analyzing the narratives of 8th and 11th graders in detail, we found both a strong presence of master narrative characteristics as well as a significant change toward more historically sophisticated accounts. This agrees with research indicating the power of the national historical narrative as a cultural tool (Wertsch, 1998, 2002) and with research about the slight increase in the sophistication of the students' historical narratives and concepts as a consequence of history learning (Berti & Andriolo, 2001; Carretero & Lee, 2014; Lee, 2005), as will be considered here in more detail.

Taking all narrative characteristics together and looking at the narrative patterns, the majority of 8th graders manifest a predominantly master narrative representation about the historical process of the emergence of their own nation, as 83% of their narratives demonstrated at least three of the four characteristics. Eleventh graders clearly differ, as 25% demonstrated at least three of the four characteristics, suggesting that a change has occurred. In parallel, the school history contents offered to the 11th graders are usually more complex than those that have been presented to 8th graders. Yet, a considerable amount of master narrative representations still exist in the 11th grade. The national master narrative continues to be reproduced wholly or in part by students that have been taught more detailed historical contents, indicating its perseverance. Even though there is a change towards more sophisticated historical accounts from 6% in the 8th grade to 40% in the 11th grade, the latter percentage is still less than half of the narratives told by the older students. This is a lot, considering that the students are in the educational phase in which they are exposed to the most complex historical material on the national past that most of them will be ever confronted with at all. Not much more formal history learning will happen in most of their lives. It is therefore plausible to expect that adults do not develop much more sophisticated representations. This is confirmed in studies indicating

that adults reproduce more of a master narrative about their own nation (Carretero, Lopez, et al., 2012; Wertsch, 2002).

Now, master narratives in general have been considered in earlier research, but this research offers a more detailed look at four different dimensions of the narrative. Distinguishing these four, the change can be looked at per narrative characteristic and in comparison to each other. In the case of the historical subject and the historical events, results are similar, with the great majority of 8th graders (89% on both characteristics) and approximately half of the 11th graders (50% and 40%, respectively) demonstrating the master narrative characteristic. A similar significant difference is found between 8th and 11th graders with respect to the nation concept. However, this characteristic is encountered less frequently than the other two characteristics. The lower percentage of 8th graders (67%) and 11th graders (25%) demonstrating an essentialist nation concept indicates a generally more developed historical understanding of the nation than that of the historical subject and events. As has been mentioned earlier, history learning with respect to the nation concept seems somewhat easier than with respect to these other two narrative characteristics. Indeed, Germán (age 13) showed how a constructed nation is easier to accept than a constructed national identity. The national identity is safeguarded in the narrative of a homogeneous historical subject with one logical course of action. The Argentine nation might not have been there since always, but it was nevertheless the predestined and anticipated objective of the historical subject and the historical events. Many 11th graders demonstrate an understanding of the 25th of May similar to that of Germán. Of the 8th graders, 33% already have a more constructivist view of the nation, as compared to 75% in 11th grade. The latter is the highest percentage of a more disciplinary representation on the four dimensions studied. Most of the students by the 11th grade know that there was no such a thing as an Argentine nation 200 years ago. History education, combined with cognitive development and an increasing exposure to cultural devices, has probably been effective in producing a conceptual change. However, many misunderstandings remain with respect to the historical subject and the historical events.

With respect to the identification narrative characteristic, rather different results have been obtained in comparison to the other three characteristics. No difference was found between 8th and 11th graders; therefore, talking about *us* in the past tense does not seem to disappear with the combined effect of history education, cognitive development, and other cultural influences. This pervading collective voice, transcending historical processes, has been found by other researchers in the field (Barton, 2008; Wertsch, 2002). The nation has become so real and ingrained into present daily practices and discourse that *we* is applied indiscriminately. Billig (1995) already suggested this in introducing his idea of *banal nationalism*. Yet it should be

taken into account that nationalism in a formerly colonized part of the world is very different from the colonizers' nationalism. Postcolonial theory (Young, 2001) elucidates the differences in historical contexts for these nationalisms. This might also explain why the nation concept is not that essentialist, but that the narrative theme is mostly simplified around the quest for freedom: The Argentine nation did not exist but it was aimed at by the revolutionaries. The results nevertheless indicate a pervasiveness of the master narrative cultural tool in terms of identification. By using *us* while describing the protagonists of historical events over 200 years ago, past and present are confounded. History education is supposed to generate an understanding of the relation between past and present. If students do not understand that past and present are very different epistemological worlds (Carretero & Solcoff, 2012; Lowenthal, 1985), this is not only confusion but also a misconception in opposition to the development of historical thinking (Levesque, 2008; Seixas, 2004; Wineburg, 2001) and ultimately a limited understanding of the complex and dynamic present. In this sense, identification is conceived to be a possible inhibitor to historical understanding. However, identification is likely to also play a positive role in history learning, in terms of approaching the past or otherness. Social identities have been found as possible facilitators and inhibitors of a complex history learning (Bellino & Selman, 2012; Epstein & Schiller, 2005; Goldberg, 2013; Goldberg, Baruch, & Porat, 2011; Hammack, 2010). Another empirical study in our line of research (Lopez, Carretero, & Rodriguez-Moneo, 2014b) indicates that when telling the narrative of a nation that is not their own, students present a more elaborated historical narrative. This might be because this narrative is not committed to supporting their national identity. These findings do not necessarily imply that teaching should no longer aim at identity construction. Rather, from an instructional point of view, it seems that it would be useful to present master narratives in a comparative context, where students can analyze master narratives of different nations.

Developing implications for both history education and learning, it should be taken into account that misconceptions or simplified national historical narratives are persisting. This is probably due to many informal sources of historical information such as the media and traditions full of historical stereotypes. At the same time, significant change in the narratives has been found, as can be observed when comparing Argentine 8th graders to 11th graders. Particularly with respect to the concept of nation, a better disciplinary historical understanding is found. This suggests a first step towards improving the whole narrative representation. Elsewhere (Lopez et al., 2014a) the idea that the process of change of historical concepts could be better understood if embedded in historical narratives has been developed and empirically supported. Thus, improving students' representations starts with helping them develop a more constructive notion of nation and proceeds to reflect on the homogenous historical subject and unidirectional events. If students and citizens in general are able to distinguish the different dimensions of a

master narrative, they might approach a disciplinary view of the nation more successfully. Thus, they might be able to understand that the nation is the result of a historical, political, and social process instead of a preexisting entity with a teleological destiny. Also, they might learn with more ease that both national narratives and nations are representational tools that can be reflected on with historical consciousness and thinking abilities, such as comparing sources and contextualizing (Seixas, 2004; Wineburg, 2001).

The students' more disciplinary historical narratives indicate that history learning is possible, but at the same time the results support the idea of the national historical narrative as a powerful cultural tool. The narratives of the students that were interviewed to a great extent coincide with a master narrative, in agreement with the comparison between produced and consumed national historical narratives (Carretero & Bermudez, 2012). Also, these results support previous empirical and theoretical analyses (Wertsch, 1998, 2002). However, as Wertsch already indicated, master narratives can be contested, and therefore educational emphasis on a more disciplinary historical approach might gradually change national historical representations. To be able to better understand the process behind the change or perseverance of the national historical narrative during adolescence and into adulthood, additional cross-sectional and longitudinal studies will need to be carried out.

This study has contributed by looking at the narratives in more detail. It suggests that narratives can be evaluated in terms of the historical information they provide and that information acquired by historical research can be introduced. History does a particularly good job at investigating change. History even reflects on itself, and on the concepts and narratives it produces, as changing (Koselleck, 1975/2004). Historical investigation can thus introduce change into collective representation. Recognizing that even the national narrative and its subject can change, we are one step closer to understanding the dynamic world we live in. More generally, we can accept that historical information is given a narrative format, as long as the narrative is reflected on with the proper critical historical attitude. This is something that Marguerite Yourcenar already said much more elegantly.

2.

THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE RELATION BETWEEN NATIONAL PAST AND PRESENT IN THE APPROPRIATION OF HISTORICAL MASTER NARRATIVES⁸

ABSTRACT

Master narratives about national history have been recognized as powerful cultural tools, influencing both historical understanding and national identity construction. For example, by the work of James Wertsch and studies on national history representation from a sociocultural point of view. However, the appropriation of these narratives needs to be considered in more detail for a clearer picture of how the nation is imagined and how this representation could change. In this paper a contribution is made by analyzing how the relation between past and present is constructed in master narrative representation, based on interviews with high school students narrating national history and presidential discourse commemorating it. It is proposed that the relation between past and present is constructed in three ways: past and present are identified; the past is idealized and their relation is teleologically constructed. By looking at how past and present are related in representations of the national past, the functioning of national historical myths as cultural tool becomes more clear. This contributes to clarifying how the master narrative constrains historical understanding and how it might enable national identification processes.

INTRODUCTION

The construction of the relation between past and present can be approached from different disciplinary and interdisciplinary viewpoints (Bevernage & Lorenz, 2013). Whereas a psychological point of view might emphasize how people construct this relation making sense of their past from their present (e.g. Straub, 2005), a historiographical perspective generally emphasizes taking a distance from the present to study the past in its own right and to study the causal relations between the past and present (Burke, 2001). Establishing a dialogue between these two perspectives is complex, particularly when attempts to historicize processes meet attempts to universalize or naturalize them (Millstone, 2012; Knights, 2012). Nevertheless there have already been several efforts to interdisciplinary approach issues that interest both historians and psychologists. This has been done in terms of collective memory and social representations (Glaveanu & Yamamoto, 2012; Liu & Hilton, 2005), but also in the extensive cognitive and educational studies on history understanding (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Carretero & Voss, 1994; Carretero, Asensio & Rodriguez Moneo, 2012; Seixas, 2004; Wineburg, 2001) and

⁸ Co-authored with Mario Carretero and accepted for publication by *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*.

more recently the so-called “public uses of history” (Bjerg, 2011; Levi & Revel, 2002). Even though these approaches differ in terms of emphasis on either memory or history (see Rosa Rivero, 2004, and Burke, 2005, on the difference), they share the idea that a historical dimension needs to be introduced, whether in psychological investigation, in considering social scientific concepts or in education. Particularly the notion of ‘cultural tool’ allows for building meaningful bridges between history and psychology, as they are historically constructed and interiorized to constitute psychological processes (Wertsch, 1998). Because they are taught cultural tools also allow for education to enter into the interdisciplinary dialogue between history and psychology. In the current discussion of the construction of relations between past and present we situate ourselves in this multidisciplinary field and focus on master narratives as cultural tools influencing this construction. More specifically, our theoretical and empirical framework attempts to integrate the cognitive constructivism from developmental and educational psychology with the cultural psychology of mediational means, while centering on historical narratives of nation (Carretero & Bermudez, 2012). Not individual narrative constructions relating past and present but national historical narratives framing this relation are at the center of this argument.

The present paper advocates the historicity of the construction of the relation between past and present with respect to the nation. We propose that the imagination of nation is both a cognitive, cultural and historical process. In agreement with the seminal work by Anderson (1983) and Hobsbawm and Ranger (1983) and many social scientists in their wake, the nation, as concept and narrative, is considered itself historical. Billig (1995) and Reicher and Hopkins (2001) have contributed to this idea from a social psychological point of view, emphasizing that nations and nationalism should not be naturalized and that national identity is a historical category as well as a social category, interiorized throughout various social psychological processes. According to these authors representations of the past, such as master narratives, contribute to that naturalization. In this sense the relation between the past and present nation has been taught and learned since the nation became a project of politicians, historians and educators in the 19th century. Indeed, history as a discipline initially was national history aimed at legitimizing political projects and creating national citizenry around the world (Berger, 2012). Smith (1991) considered that most nations have been built on a myth of origin, a kind of master narrative. Master narratives play an important role in the imagination of nation, not only in the invention but in sustaining national identity as well. Myths of origin have come to the attention of sociocultural psychology and are found to be spread out through a number of educational and cultural artifacts (Jovchelovitch, 2012). “Official” and “unofficial” historical narratives have also attracted attention (Wertsch & Rozin, 2000), in terms of what they include and exclude. Many studies about history textbooks and curriculum contents have shown how they have been

influenced by their original purpose of constructing national identities (Nakou & Barca, 2010) and how they sustain “official” or national historical narratives and myths of origin (Ferro, 1984-2000; Foster, 2012; Van Sledright, 2008). Master narratives in general are increasingly considered as a unit of analysis in the social sciences. Heller (2006) describes master narratives as general interpretation patterns and considers that their function is making sense of the past, present, and future of a cultural community. In a similar vein, Wertsch (2004) proposed that repeatable elements of historical narratives form schematic narrative templates in our minds, but distinguishes specific historical narratives from the pattern that manifests in these narratives. The theoretical and empirical scope of the notion of master narrative is rather broad. We understand it as national myth of origin or the grand narrative of nation. In agreement with Penuel and Wertsch (2000) we approach master narratives theoretically and empirically as ‘cultural tools’ (Carretero & Bermudez, 2012; Wertsch, 1998, 2002). This means that they are produced and propagated for particular (political, educational) purposes, and that they are appropriated or ‘consumed’ by students or citizens. There have been many historical and educational studies on the production of master narratives, on why they were implemented in the first place and how they manifest over and over again on national curricula or in school history textbooks (Alridge, 2006; Ferro, 1984-2002; Foster & Crawford, 2006). However, as with cultural tools in general, the production of these national historical contents does not guarantee their consumption and appropriation (Wertsch, 1998). Therefore our attention has been drawn to studying the appropriation of the master narrative as a cultural tool. Wertsch (2002) uses appropriation to refer to active internalization of textual means and distinguishes two levels: mastery (cognitively managing the narrative) and appropriation as such (making the narrative one’s own, possibly transforming it). In this vein, we consider appropriation to refer to different degrees of active internalization that can vary between echoing other voices or narratives and telling or using them as one’s own. As seen in the theory of mediated action (Wertsch, 1998) the objectives of the cultural tool and the objectives of the agent using the cultural tool are not necessarily the same. Agents using the master narrative as cultural tool might not be aware of its inherent objectives, which might even be at odds with their own objectives. However, they can also reject or resist the master narrative. In this sense, the agent’s construction of a representation of national history can be more or less framed by the master narrative.

Master narratives, as we understand them, are intimately related with history education. National histories were born to be taught, traditionally to foster social cohesion and national identities (Berger, 2012). History education has used narrative as a principal vehicle and has been predominantly focused on national history (Barton & Levstik, 2004). However, history education has two different objectives in tension with one another (Carretero, 2011). It has, throughout disciplinary developments, not only aimed at the construction of national identities

but also at understanding the past. The former objective of history education is in line with the traditional romantic view of teaching history. This view emphasizes the past as a model for, or justification of, the present and values identification with the past. Particularly, it involves a positive assessment of the own national past, present and future, and the political processes connecting them. The latter objective is more recent in history education and aligns with a disciplinary view. This view proposes the comprehension of the past as such, of historical time and change, of complex multi-causality, and approaching methods of historiography to relate the past to the present (Carretero & Bermudez, 2012). Whereas the former objective is served by the master narrative, history understanding as an educational objective is inspired by contemporary historiography. According to this objective students should be able to distinguish past and present scenarios, in order to avoid presentism (Lowenthal, 1985), and establish a meaningful relation with the past or achieve historical consciousness (Rüsen, 2004; Seixas, 2004). 'Thinking historically' (Levesque, 2008), as an objective of history teaching and learning, is the capacity to analyze the complex social and political situations of the present, taking into account the influence of past events. The master narrative has been considered to enable national identity construction but constrain historical understanding (Alridge, 2006; Carretero & Kriger, 2011; Wertsch, 1998). However, in further studying the master narrative as a cultural tool in relation to history education objectives, we think it is necessary to look at how past and present are related through this narrative as opposed to the disciplinary construction of this relation.

Constructing causal relations between past and present is at the core of historiography and has been a matter of methodological debate in the discipline. According to the now referential work of Carr (1961) and Bloch (1953), past and present can neither be absolutely differentiated (as in 'the past is not accessible from the present') nor can there be a simple identification between them (as in 'the past can be simply accessed from the present'). Rather, being aware of how foreign the past is from our present conceptual framework, a historian should construct this relation carefully by letting a present question interact with different sources from the past. Debates on history and its methods continue (see for example Megill, 2007) but it is safe to say that historiography aims at staying clear from anachronistic, reductionist, determinist, presentist and teleological explanation as ways of connecting past and present. That is, past and present should not be reduced to one another, the past should not entirely determine the present, the past cannot be fully understood through present frameworks and concepts, nor can the present be taken as a goal towards which the past has been orientated (see also Carretero & Solcoff, 2012; Fischer, 1970).

Now, the emphasis on national identity facilitates other constructions than the emphasis on investigating the national past and historicizing the nation. Master narratives present the historical continuity of the nation. The identity of nation and nationals, fundamental for establishing the master narrative's protagonist, implies that in national terms past and present are the same. Changing the emphasis in history education from national identity construction to historical understanding has been difficult, both in terms of educational implication and impact on learning. This, we hypothesize, is a result of the pervasiveness of master narratives and invites considering them in more detail.

To this end an analytical model of master narrative production and consumption has been proposed (Carretero, 2011; Carretero & Bermudez, 2012). The presented features of this model, or national historical narrative characteristics, are in brief: a historical subject of national events established in logical opposition to another nation and national identity; historical events set in terms of personalist and concrete attempts at freedom and progress of the nation; heroic examples and moral directions; and the transcendental character of the nation and national identity. Research about how national historical narratives are represented by students found that, when asked about the event that marks the origin of the nation, most their narrations demonstrate these master narrative characteristics (Carretero, a, Gonzalez & Rodriguez Moneo, 2012; Carretero & Van Alphen, 2014; Lopez, Carretero & Rodriguez-Moneo, 2014 a; Lopez, Carretero & Rodriguez-Moneo, 2014 b). These results were found both in Spain and Argentina, among adults and adolescents. The presence of these features, along with studies in history learning and cultural psychology, suggests a predominantly master narrative representation of national history in which particular constructions of the relations between past and present appear. As the master narrative establishes the identity of a nation, its past and present are directly related through a protagonist, action and goal.

In the following we attempt to clarify how master narratives, produced for national identity construction and consumed by students and citizens, involve connecting past and present. As seen from a sociocultural point of view (Carretero & Bermudez, 2012; Wertsch, 2002), this means considering in more detail the appropriation of the master narrative as a cultural tool. At the same time we attempt to develop the interdisciplinary dialogue between historiography and psychology on the tension between master narrative and historiographical accounts of the national past. In this sense, analyzing the construction of the relation between past and present allows for reflecting on how master narratives as cultural tools constrain historical understanding when this concerns the own nation.

As will be further argued in this paper, master narratives that aim at fostering national identity connect the national past and present in particular ways. Three ways of the master narrative constructing the relation between past and present are discussed, as they appear in both students' narratives about national history and politicians' commemorative discourses. Firstly, there's identification of past and present, taking national identity as a natural and transcendental category. Secondly, there's idealization of the past, taking it as a moral, heroic or patriotic example. Finally, there's a teleological interpretation of the past, taking the result of a historical process as its inherent and predetermined goal.

THREE CONSTRUCTIONS RELATING PAST AND PRESENT IN STUDENTS' MASTER NARRATIVES

Three different constructions of the relation between the past and the present could be distinguished in master narrative representation, as will be illustrated by fragments from interviews carried out in our ongoing investigation (see also Carretero & Van Alphen, 2014). The interviews focused on the narratives about the events marking what later came to be considered as the origin of the Argentine nation, and therefore on capturing the master narrative in the Argentine subject's representation of the national past. The historical events in Buenos Aires on the 25th of May 1810 that are referred to can be compared to the Boston Tea Party in the United States and to historical events symbolizing the origin of nation all over America (Ortemberg, 2013). These narratives are often referred to as 'myth of origin' (Jovchelovitch, 2012; Smith, 1991) and share the theme of independence or freedom from colonial rule. The same events are recalled in the presidential discourses presented later on, in which the same constructions of the relation between past and present can be found. The interviews were conducted in Spanish. The presented fragments as well as the discourse by president Fernandez de Kirchner were translated by the authors and revised by a native English speaker.

Participants

A total of 18 sixteen year old Argentine high school students, representing the urban middle class, were interviewed. They had studied the May 25 events in history class a year before. History plays an important role as a subject matter on the Argentine curriculum and it is studied for four full years. The processes of Independence are given much detailed consideration. Like many Argentines, the students are most familiar with these events because they are celebrated every year on the 25th of May, in and out of school, as the events marking the origin of the Argentine nation. The patriotic rituals carried out on this day are mandatory in Argentine primary and secondary schools. How these students view the national past is particularly interesting given their recent exposure to the school history on the subject and their pending

political participation, as the right to vote at 16 was introduced in Argentina a couple of years ago. A first analysis in terms of master narrative characteristics (see Carretero & Van Alphen, 2014) found that the accounts of four students did not demonstrate these characteristics. In their accounts the master narrative was rejected and more disciplinary historical explanations were given. Also, the relation between the past and the present was established differently (see *analytic strategy*).

Procedure

Semi-structured interviews (Duveen & Gilligan, 2013) were conducted to obtain the students' narrative representation. The same kinds of questions were asked to all the participants, but the interviewer would be guided by their answers in the course of the interview. The individual interviews took place at the public high school that these students attended, they lasted about 30 minutes and were recorded following the student's consent. The interviewees were presented a well known painting of the so-called May Revolution and asked to take their time to elaborate what happened in the represented event, why it happened and who participated.

Analytic strategy

Specific parts of the interviews were analyzed to take a look at how the relation between past and present was constructed in the context of the master narratives told by the students. Namely, their answers to the questions whether those participating on May 25, 1810 were Argentines, whether they were Argentines as Argentines nowadays and whether they felt Argentines like nowadays. The questions invited the students to elaborate a relation between past and present with respect to national identity, while at the same time inviting reflection on historical change. This relation can be constructed in ways very different to the master narrative construction, as was the case in the four master narrative rejections. That is, according to the sources, at the time of the 1810 events Argentines did not exist, nor did Argentina or any kind of collective identity similar to the Argentine identity nowadays (Chiaramonte, 1989). These historical considerations can be applied to other countries in the decolonized world. This is to say, the British colonists carried out the Boston Tea Party in 1765. Like the Spanish colonists carried out the *Cabildo Abierto*, the town council meeting on May 25th 1810. Historically the former cannot be considered a U.S. citizen, like the latter cannot be considered an Argentine citizen. The 18th century people and present nationals also differ because two centuries ago only a very small part of the population was a full citizen. Women, slaves and natives were not considered as such. However, in master narratives a continuity between past and present national identity is typically presumed suggesting that all the (Argentine) people were involved or represented. The answers to the particular questions about the national identity are relevant

here, because they can illustrate how master narratives format the relation between national past and present. Considering how students answered these specific questions allowed us to distinguish identification, idealization and teleology as ways of constructing the relation between past and present through master narratives.

IDENTIFYING PAST AND PRESENT

In master narratives past and present are related through a national sameness over time, in other words national identity. Like in this first fragment, there is something identical between those participating in the origin of the nation and the nationals now.

Those who participated [on May 25, 1810], were they Argentines like nowadays or were they different?

I suppose that the habits must be different and their way of life and all that, but I suppose they would be Argentines like Argentines nowadays. [...]

Did they feel Argentine?

Yes, if they wanted an Argentine government yes. No doubt.

Because of what they wanted?

Of course, for what they wanted to achieve, to stop depending from Spain.

Did they feel Argentines like Argentines today?

Yes, I suppose so, I'm sure. Like nowadays we fight for the Malvinas at that time they fought for the country itself. The feeling was more or less the same, the sovereignty of the country.

Did they feel Argentines like you?

Yes, I feel Argentine and at that time I would have fought for the same thing.

Mariano (16)

For Mariano, even though life and habits are different, Argentines are the same then and now, particularly in the fight for sovereignty. From a historical point of view there is no similarity between the events in 1810 and the Falklands/Malvinas conflict since the 1982 war between the UK and Argentina. The historical context and the historical subject are different. Nevertheless, in the master narrative the identity of nation is constructed and people then and now are considered identical in terms of their nationality.

Mariano identifies past and present nationals and identifies himself with the national group and its common purpose too. Even though these are different operations - establishing a national similarity *between* past and present is not the same as identifying *with* the national group - they jointly appear in this interview fragment and might very well be connected. That the

identification of past and present need not explicitly involve the interviewee personally can be seen in the next fragment from a fellow student:

Do you think they felt Argentine?

Yes.

Like Argentines nowadays?

Yes, they felt Argentines, to fight against what would be Spain at that time...yes, they felt Argentines. [...]

Did they feel Argentine like you?

No, I don't think so.

Why not?

I think they felt more... they had reasons to fight, I don't have to fight for my country now, thank God.

Lucas (16)

Lucas also identifies the past and present in terms of a national identity, but does not seem to identify with the historical subject. He does talk about 'my country' in the present, so somehow historical identification between the national past and present and social identification with the nation are separated. It looks like Lucas, compared to Mariano, takes a distance from the past national historical subject but based on an idealization of past events. This is another way of the master narrative relating past and present, as we will consider next.

IDEALIZING THE PAST

If there is something 'more' in the past than in the present, particularly patriotism, ideals or union, this is not just a differentiation of past and present. Rather, the past becomes mythical or idealized. The following fragment illustrates this:

If they were Argentines at that time and nowadays they are as well, in what are they the same or different?

I think that at that time it was more open, everybody expressed what they thought and they were more united for the Independence. Today there is a lot of division.

Did they feel like Argentines at that time?

I suppose so, yes, they really felt part of one and the same country. Everybody felt part of one and the same country.

Veronica (16)

For Veronica the Argentine people in the past were more tolerant and there was a unity that is lacking in the present. From a historical point of view no such union existed (Chiaramonte, 1989; 2013), or, as a fellow student said, for slavery to be abolished and women's rights to be acknowledged 'time had to pass'. However, in terms of 'the people making themselves independent' the master narrative typically frames the remote national past. Veronica, as a consequence and comparing with the present situation, idealizes the past in terms of tolerance and unity of the people. So does Fernando, comparing himself and the Argentines today with the real patriots of 1810, in the next fragment.

Do you think they felt Argentines the same way you do?

I don't know... the feeling of being Argentine varies between every person... Because I'm not really a patriot or anything like that because... I don't know... I have different ideas but I guess that at that time everybody had the same idea, the great majority had the same ideal, aspired the same purpose.

And now it's different...

Nowadays the ideas are quite a bit separated, more or less anyway.

Fernando (16)

According to Fernando, Argentines in the present disagree more than they did in the past. Thus he emphasizes that today there is a separation rather than uniformity of Argentines. Of course, when heroic patriots celebrated in a myth of origin set the example then Argentines today can only stand in their shadow. From a historical point of view the contemporary divisions and problems can be understood quite straightforwardly, because nothing was ever lost to be regained, that is, there never was a mythical union. Internal conflicts and exclusion are found throughout history and help both in historically contextualizing and in understanding present conflicts and problems. The master narrative, nevertheless, sets a moral example to live up to and this clearly affects how past and present nationals are related.

A TELEOLOGICAL INTERPRETATION OF THE PAST

Another relation between the present and the past is constructed by an inherent *telos* of the past protagonists and events. This is the narrative's solution for sustaining a national sameness throughout processes of historical change. In the master narrative the results of the historical process are taken as its motivation or goal, not in the least because these narratives were invented many years after the historical events (Hobsbawm & Ranger, 1983). In the case of May 25 the independent nation is taken as a pre-established goal, as can be clearly seen in the following fragment:

Did they feel Argentines like Argentines nowadays?

Yes I think so, because it was a fight over time... because it was not all that easy, but rather a process that... I think that every time they took a step towards the Independence, towards that revolution, that they felt happier because it was a weight less off their backs.

Clara (16)

The protagonists already knew, as Clara does now, what was going to happen. The revolutionaries, as the first patriots, are on a national quest, the very theme of the master narrative. The Independence was pre-determined, there could have been no other outcome of the historical processes. Teleological explanations of history typically happen when looking back, taking the present as the goal of the past events, or taking a point later in time as a lens through which to look at a point earlier in time. Often there is a notion of progress or freedom underlying this kind of interpretation, in this case independence (Alridge, 2006; Barton & Levstik, 1998). Indeed, the Argentine master narrative tells of historically predetermined revolution and independence.

The teleological explanation can involve the future: the historical process we participate in presently has been aiming at a certain future goal to be achieved. In the next fragment past, present and the future are clearly teleologically related.

Were they just as Argentine as Argentines nowadays?

I think that they were the first Argentines, at the time there were lots of Argentines, but the first ones to feel like wanting a country apart from Spain, to feel that we were other people with another culture and came from somewhere else [...] I believe that the majority of who we are today, of politics, of many ideas, of many ways of thinking, was thanks to this kind of people that said this was a separate country, that we were not Spain number two, that we weren't a colony. They had the strength and courage to express... the first ideas to stop with the colonies, because the Independence happened later, but the beginning of a process that is not finished nowadays. We are a separate country and all, but sometimes we have political dependence, not that much political nowadays but perhaps economical. It's difficult to explain.[...]

Did they feel Argentines like you do now?

Yes, I believe so, sometimes I think that without all of them I would not feel as much a part of history. That has more to do with the present. I think that politics and that kind of things are a tool for change, that participating, to be able to talk, to be able to round up friends to discuss or go to another neighborhood to help, are ways of constructing a better country. They also at some point thought about that, about the weakest, about those who did not have as many opportunities as they had.

Violeta (16)

Violeta positions herself as a participant of the ongoing (inter)national economical and political challenges. The ultimate goal for her and the master narrative protagonists lies in the future. She identifies with the revolutionaries through sharing a goal she supposes they have in common. Her identification with and teleological interpretation of the past is also demonstrated when she says “sometimes I think that without all of them I would not feel as much a part of history”. This indicates how much she considers the past events to have a certain direction. The same direction as hers. We might say that the level of appropriation of the narrative is higher, as Violeta really makes the narrative her own. Nevertheless, the master narrative remains and constrains the past-present relation so that future plans cannot be conceived in another way, as if they cannot exist without legitimation from the remote past.

The teleological interpretation, common to master narratives, is much criticized in historiography (Megill, 2007). Of course, history is written from a certain present and it is inevitably involved in a dialogue with the past. However, attempting to suspend presentism is exactly what allows for seeing the historicity of national narratives and of social concepts like ‘nation’. Contextualizing the historical events involves trying to avoid taking present visions or ideals as the inherent goal of the historical process. A strategic or political use of history sits in the teleological interpretation that master narratives generate.

PAST AND PRESENT IN PRESIDENTIAL MASTER NARRATIVE APPROPRIATION

As our argument intends to show the constructions of the relation between past and present framed by the national historical master narrative, looking at students’ representations is not sufficient. The master narrative also manifests in different situations and with higher degrees of appropriation. Indeed, the three ways of relating past and present do not only occur in the master narrative representation by students, but also in the wider political use of national history, such as commemorations. Patriotic commemorations and the political use of history sustain romantic accounts of national history and are likely to influence students’ representations (see Carretero, 2011). Some similarities can be found when comparing the students’ accounts above with the speech that Cristina Fernandez de Kirchner, President of Argentina, delivered on the occasion of celebrating the 203 years since May 25, 1810.

I want to commemorate history, I want to remember those 203 years of our May Revolution, but not the bland and sanitized version so often explained to us. I want to remember and I see in all of you, in these young faces, the other young faces of French, Beruti, Moreno, Monteagudo [*some of the event’s protagonists*]. The true brains of that revolution, French and Beruti, who handed out rosettes, not to celebrate the fall of the [*Spanish*] viceroy, as we were taught, but actually to qualify people to be

allowed into the Town Hall. That's how the Revolution and other great processes of transformation in Latin America and the world took place. Young people with ideals as well [...] the ideas, together with the weapons to defend that great nation that was born, constructed history. [...] We have succeeded in articulating this, and that is the best homage we can pay to those men and women liberating the people 203 years ago. The task remained unfulfilled, because we also are still fighting. Not for liberty but for equality, the great symbol of this past decade and of those to come.⁹

President Cristina Fernandez de Kirchner matches citizens in the present with the Spanish colonists looking for Independence when stating "I want to remember and I see in all of you, in these young faces, the other young faces of French, Beruti, Moreno, Monteagudo". She both idealizes the past and identifies past and present. She invites her public to perform this identification and idealization too. In 'we are still fighting' lies the identification between past and present, similar to how Mariano above considered Argentines then and now to be alike in their fight. The fight might be different, indicates the president, but as Mariano said 'the feeling is more or less the same'. The president's idealization can be seen in the 'true brains of the revolution', as a 'great' process of transformation, and the ideas or weapons that defended the 'great nation' and constructed history. For Fernando there also was something mythical about the May revolution. In the fragment above he idealizes in terms of the shared ideals of a majority that was more patriotic in the past. Contrary to the president he does not identify between the past and the present. He emphasizes the differences between a great revolution and contemporary political division, and considers himself not really a patriot. The president mentions the similarity of some revolutionaries to the young faces in front of her. Would 16 year old Fernando have been among them? Violeta seems more likely to have been there. The presidential discourse and Violeta's account above are alike in terms of identification but particularly in the teleological aspect. The president connects past and present teleologically when she mentions the men and women liberating a people 203 years ago, whose incomplete task has been taken up in the present. Violeta talks about the beginning of a process of independence that is still going on and constructing a better country through helping others. The president mentions a shift in emphasis from liberty to equality, and later in her discourse the motto *la patria es el otro* (the other is the homeland) also appears.

Nevertheless, the president has other objectives in using the master narrative than the student has in telling the interviewer about what happened. The president gives a historical

⁹ Commemoration of the 203rd anniversary of the May Revolution: Words from the President of the Nation (25-05-2013). See <http://www.caserosada.gov.ar/discursos/26500-conmemoracion-del-203d-aniversario-de-la-revolucion-de-mayo-palabras-de-la-presidenta-de-la-nacion>, accessed on 19-01-2015.

foundation for national celebration and gives the master narrative a political and social function. The history is re-written, culminating in the very moment of delivering the speech: the national history has led up to this moment and we, the same way as our predecessors, are on a special national quest. There is no need or intention to be historically accurate or complex. The emphasis is rather on national identification: we all have something in common. In this 'political use of history' (Chiaramonte, 2013) we see a cultural tool in action, a master narrative made meaningful in function of the particular situation or celebration. And this happens elsewhere too. Let us consider for instance United States President Obama's second term presidential address.

[E]ach time we gather to inaugurate a president, we bear witness to the enduring strength of our Constitution. We affirm the promise of our democracy. We recall that what binds this nation together is not the colors of our skin or the tenets of our faith or the origins of our names. What makes us exceptional, what makes us America is our allegiance to an idea articulated in a declaration made more than two centuries ago. [...] Today we continue a never-ending journey to bridge the meaning of those words with the realities of our time. [...] The patriots of 1776 did not fight to replace the tyranny of a king with the privileges of a few, or the rule of a mob. They gave to us a republic, a government of, and by, and for the people. Entrusting each generation to keep safe our founding creed. And for more than 200 years we have. Through blood drawn by lash, and blood drawn by sword, we noted that no union founded on the principles of liberty and equality could survive half slave, and half free. We made ourselves anew, and vowed to move forward together.¹⁰

The political developments described in this speech are presented as a teleological trend: "Through blood drawn by lash, and blood drawn by sword, we noted that no union founded on the principles of liberty and equality could survive half slave, and half free". And there is a clear transcendental "we" uniting past and present in "We made ourselves anew, and vowed to move forward together". The republic has dramatically changed during 200 years, but these changes appear subordinated to an idealized connection between past and present. The exceptionality of the people in the present is awarded by the constitution established in the past. However, isn't this exceptionality a product of a myth of origin?

More than in a situation of delivering a political speech, the student interviewed about the 25th of May 1810 has the opportunity to historically and critically construct the relation between past and present. Fernando and Veronica are critical about the present, but they

¹⁰ President Obama's second inaugural address (Transcript). Washington Post, January 21, 2013; http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/president-obamas-second-inaugural-address-transcript/2013/01/21/f148d234-63d6-11e2-85f5-a8a9228e55e7_story.html. Accessed on 19-01-2015.

idealize the past. In this aspect, but even more so in terms of identification and teleological explanation, the presidential discourse and the teenager's narrative about the same national historical event resemble each other rather than a historiographical account. The demonstrated constructions of the relation between past and present take the past to be very similar to the present, they take the past as an example for the present, or they take the present as a goal set in the past. And they appear even though the master narrative is appropriated in different situations in different degrees. This indicates the pervasiveness of the master narrative, but furthermore that identification, idealization and teleological explanation can be taken as the particular ways of connecting past and present through master narratives across different levels of appropriation.

DISCUSSION

Recent developments in conceptual history (Koselleck, 2004) and conceptual change in History (Leinhardt, 2013; Carretero, Castorina and Levinas, 2013; Carretero & Lee, 2014) acknowledge that every historical study of the past is influenced by the present, because historical concepts are symbolic tools undergoing a process of change over time. This implies that the conceptualization of the past happens through present concepts, but also that there are traces of the past in our present concepts. Both classical historiographical positions (Carr, 1961) and new developments in historiography (Burke, 2001) maintain that the conceptual differentiation between past and present is necessary to study their possible and mutual relations. Thus, for example, Lowenthal (1985) has maintained that the past is a "foreign country", indicating that our direct experiences with heritage and museums need to be reconceptualized. Wineburg (2001) has developed this idea for history education, indicating that thinking historically is an *unnatural act* that cannot be carried out just from present conceptualization. Moreover the concepts and social practices in which they are employed are themselves historical and considering their historicity is an important contribution that history makes to psychology. We think that the study of collective memory is very important to fathom the psychological construction of the relation between past and present, but we emphasize that particularly in the representation of remote history certain models of relating the past and the present play a determining role. The national historical representation is mediated by cultural tools, and here a tension between master narrative and historical investigation exists. This tension is further illustrated by the present paper. More specifically identification of past and present, idealization and teleology, as presented above, play an important role in this tension.

Looking at how national past and present are connected provides insights about the constructions at work in master narratives as cultural tools and also gives an idea about how they might enable national identification and constrain historical understanding. As illustrated by the interview and discourse fragments, the relation between national past and present is constructed in three different ways in agreement with the master narrative. In terms of an effect of the two opposing objectives of history education mentioned above, one has apparently had more impact than the other. This doesn't mean that the relation cannot be otherwise meaningfully constructed, but that there is a dominant way of constructing this relation aimed at sustaining national identity. That is, the three presented constructions support a transcendent national identity.

The effect of the master narrative cultural tool can be considered positively, in terms of what is enabled. Certainly, the identification function of history education and narrative is important in citizenship or moral education (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Bellino & Selman, 2012) and in matters of social cohesion and group formation for emancipation (Hammack, 2010; Jovchelovitch, 2012). However, the specific role of the master narrative in enabling civic identification is not that clear. Some of our interview fragments suggest that the historical identification between past and present nationals and the identification with nationals are not the same thing. The social psychological identification with past and present nationals is aimed at with the master narrative, but ultimately depends on how the individual relates to the master narrative and to the national group in general. A higher level of appropriation, involving personal identification, depends also on the circumstances in which the master narrative is invoked (see Wertsch, 2002). So is civic identification constructed by these narratives? Idealizing the national past could be a convenient way of not identifying with the national group. Considering oneself to be less patriotic than revolutionaries in the past can be a justification for not participating politically in the present. Historical identification too often means historical exclusion and is hardly compatible with current ideas about cosmopolitan or multicultural citizenship (Abowitz, 2002; Hansen, 2012). On the other hand, a teleological interpretation with a clear personal ideological involvement could indicate the active citizenship of the narrator. Either way, how civic identification is exactly related to the master narrative that connects the past and the present in certain ways, is a matter for further investigation.

National identification has been recognized as both a facilitator and inhibitor of historical understanding (Epstein & Schiller, 2005; Goldberg, 2013; Goldberg, Baruch & Porat, 2011; Hammack, 2010; Lopez et al., 2014 b). That is, it can generate the student's interest but also introduce a bias in representing the past. In the current paper the construction of the

relation between past and present through master narrative appears to be clearly different from the historical construction of this relation. More work is necessary on exploring whether combining the effects of the two objectives of history education is possible or leads to much confusion in the individual representation (Hammack, 2010; Lopez & Carretero, 2012; Carretero & Kriger, 2011). Yet, from a historiographic perspective, the three master narrative constructions imply that a differentiation of past and present is lacking and that therefore the causal historical relations between past events and present situations cannot be well understood. If the nation is basically the same in the past, present and probably in the future, then change and otherness are not accounted for. If the past is idealized there is no historical contextualization, and this is important to understand the more remote (pre)national past. Finally, a teleological interpretation involves historical predetermination and a biased or linear view of the past. The political use of history is very well served by these constructions. However, the students' or citizens' construction of relations between past and present might not be. Particularly when they are interested in understanding the past or making new plans for the future. They might have objectives that differ from the master narrative objectives or the political strategies employing these narratives. Idealizing the past, and at the same time underestimating the present, typically ignores the many conflicts at the time of the so favorably portrayed protagonists and events. It often overstates the role and impact of personal intentions and does not consider how political, social and economic factors interact in a complex way at a specific historical moment. These past conflicts and interacting factors, however, could help in contextualizing present problems. At the very least it would help to know that the past was not necessarily better. Teleological interpretations make sense of the past and reaffirm present positions, but in doing so predetermine past, present and also future in terms of one limited view of change and progress. Historical understanding reaches far beyond the mere appreciation of historiographical discipline. It involves the formation of critical thinkers that are able to contextualize, move beyond their own perspective, and pluralize ideas about change. Do master narratives and the particular relations between past and present involved contribute to this formation?

We emphasize that relating past and present through national identity is not the only possible way of individually making sense of history, but a product of certain political strategies and historical developments materialized in master narratives. Before stating that master narratives are necessary in framing projects and identities, we think they need to be considered in more detail as historically constructed and evaluated in terms of their functionality and, more importantly, for whom exactly.

3.

IDENTITIES: NEVER THE SAME AGAIN?¹¹

ABSTRACT

In response to the suggestion of treating identity as a historically bound notion (Matusov and Smith Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science 46, 2012), its genealogy is further explored. First establishing that identity has been understood in a particular personal way, and that genealogy might carry beyond this conception, as it also carries beyond the notions of class and adolescence that are used to contextualize identity. Then opting for treating historically bound notions as dynamic, studying them in the continuous interaction between conceptualization and practice, as processes and verbs rather than essences and substantives. Finally suggesting to dissociate identity from selfhood by looking at why, when and to whom we need to identify ourselves and also inverting the question: why and when do we ask others to identify themselves? After all, sameness and difference are two sides of a coin called identity, and what is looked at is a matter of how it is looked at.

Identity is a widely used but poorly defined notion. Faced with its myriad uses in the human and social sciences, Matusov and Smith (2012) propose a genealogical analysis. In earlier conceptual clarifications scholars have criticized the acclaimed universality of identity and advocated a more flexible, diverse, relational notion. However, say Matusov and Smith, they do not take into account that 'identity' is contextually and historically bound. In agreement with Michel Foucault's anti-essentialist method and emphasis on historical practices, they suggest to move from a conceptual world to the history of socio-economic classes. Identity is situated responding to, and making sense in, US middle class society during the 1950's. Their main argument, also based on multicultural experiences contesting the notion of identity, is that the ecological validity of identity across contexts is limited and cannot simply be transferred from one to the next. With this argument and the call for genealogical analysis the authors make an important contribution. Also their analysis of middle class discourse is very interesting. However, some circularity can be observed between the definition of identity they criticize and the context in which they situate its emergence. Also, in criticizing one notion other social scientific notions are maintained, and apart from power on a micro level, some macro-level mechanisms are presupposed. Thus providing an occasion to wonder about the complexity of genealogy, the changing meaning of identity, and alternative ways of seeing ourselves.

¹¹ Published in 2012 in *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, 46, 296-302.

THE GENEALOGY OF (A PARTICULAR) IDENTITY

The analysis starts out with Erikson's classical notion of identity. From his research, done mainly among European-American middle class adolescents, identity arose as a problem or crisis specific for youths, related to the difficult career choices they had to make. Matusov and Smith argue that the preoccupation with self and perception of choices is something particularly middle class, as it arises in the US after the world wars. They define "the phenomenon of identity as a historically emerged public discourse about negotiation between available ready-made choices and discourse on self." (p.10). Particularly the emphasis on individual choice in the notion of identity is criticized, as it cannot be generalized across contexts. The authors warn for imposing the specific cultural practices of talking about the self and (wishful) thinking in terms of choices. Indeed, it is harmful to make people responsible for their own misery if they do not possess the luxury to determine themselves. Yet, the notion of identity analyzed in this article is particularly personal. As it is local, it should not reach as far beyond its context as it currently does, but it is somehow unsatisfactory that the genealogy of identity starts with Erikson. The notion thus becomes a researchers crystallization of the context in which he worked, bound to involve some particular intellectual interest.¹² It tells us about how a great deal of psychology, particularly when boosting individual choice, is based on the US middle class, but less about the power practices giving rise to identity.

When practicing genealogy, we seek the non-essentialist. Foucault states in his chapter on Nietzsche, *Genealogy, History*: "no one is responsible for an emergence; no one can glory in it, since it always occurs in the interstice" (1999, p. 85). Certainly Erikson did not invent identity, nor was he the one to give it a personal meaning. Indeed, in genealogical analysis I find it particularly difficult to figure out where to start, as there are always previous conditions diversifying into the past as roots into the ground. Matusov and Smith are concerned with a particular notion of identity, such as: "people tell others who they are, but even more importantly, they tell themselves and they try to act as though they are who they say they are. These self-understandings, especially those with strong emotional resonance for the teller, are what we refer to as identities." (p.12). Their concerns with an objectifying and universalist notion are much appreciated, but I'd like to know about the "various systems of subjection" and "the hazardous play of dominations" (Foucault 1999, p. 83) beyond and before the notion, or at least how it was appropriated by psychology. So, what was there before Erikson?

¹² In parallel in the research by Gee, as mentioned by Matusov and Smith, "the identity discourse may in fact be co-constructed between the University-based researcher and the high-school subjects" p. 14

Searching for 'identity' in old English and French dictionaries is not really a Foucauldian thing to do. That's why Matusov and Smith steer away from a conceptual world towards social history. Yet, the notions they use to contextualize, 'class' and 'adolescence', are just as historical as 'identity'. This is at least what becomes clear in a history of concepts, studying the interaction between concepts and practices, quite different from the much criticized history of ideas. The dictionary could be a point of departure for 'Begriffsgeschichte' taking (social) practices into account (Koselleck 1996) or a way to start investigating interaction effects between human categories and practices (Hacking 1995). This might clarify where Erikson got his 'identity' from. So in my curiosity I did a little conceptual exploration.

Now, it seems that before referring to something distinctively personal, identity just meant 'sameness'. The definition of Gillis (1994), stating that the core meaning of any individual or group identity is a sense of sameness over time and space, is reminiscent of the Latin root 'idem'. Consulting a couple of 18th and late 19th century dictionaries suggests that identity became a personal matter in the course of the eighteenth hundreds. In the former we can find entries such as 'identity is defined by metaphysicians, to be the agreement of two or more things in another' (Bailey 1742) or 'ce qui fait que deux ou plusieurs choses ne sont qu'une, sont comprises sous une même idée' (Dictionnaire de l'Académie Française, 1798). Identity does not appear as something personal or a sense of self. The psychological notion is found later: 'the sameness of a person or thing at all times or in all circumstances; the condition or fact that a person or thing is itself and not something else; individuality, personality' (Murray 1888). Here 'personal identity' is explicitly mentioned, with reference to Locke's definition (the sameness of a rational being) and to Hume's (identity is common for every being whose existence has any duration). In the French counterpart, of course, reference is made to French philosophers; following Voltaire and Rousseau identity is 'conscience qu'une personne a d'elle-même' (Émile Littré: Dictionnaire de la langue française, 1872–77).

Identity has two seemingly contradictory meanings nowadays, one referring to sameness and another to differentiating an individual. Wondering how the logical operation of 'idem' could end up meaning its personified opposite, I stumbled upon the 1835 Dictionnaire de l'Académie Française specifying that identity is used particularly in jurisprudence when talking about recognizing a person under arrest, an escaped prisoner, a dead man, etc. That rings a bell, indeed Foucault himself situates the birth of the subject, coinciding with that of the sciences gathering knowledge about subjects, in disciplinary and punitive practices (1977). How the genealogy of the personal notion of identity is related to the genealogy written by Foucault is a question begging further investigation. Was 'identity' personalized or subjectified in the same process or context that gave rise to psychology, or was the notion appropriated and transformed by

psychology? Was it an interaction between intellectual ideas such as those of Locke and Rousseau on the one hand and disciplinary practices on the other? Or, taking sameness of the self as difference from others, are the two meanings not that contradictory after all? The conceptual development becomes a little more clear in Ricoeur's distinction between *ipse* identity (sameness in the first-person: self-constancy) and *idem* identity (sameness in the third-person: object constancy; 1992). Be it however it may, personal identity goes further back.

Erikson's notion of identity arose in a context where the administration and categorization of the individual, in terms of gender, nationality and class, was fully functional, and where selfhood and its scientific study had already been developing. The further individualization of the notion might be indebted to US middle class society, as it is also where psychology boomed in academic productivity, but let's not forget that a great deal of discourse and practices were likely inherited from or in communication with their continental counterparts. The US context was one of cultural importation and hybridization. The notion of identity has probably never been crystal clear, neither essential nor objective, inheriting from different contexts and adapted in others.

DYNAMIC IDENTITY

As genealogy "demands relentless erudition" (Foucault 1999, p. 77) and therefore much confuses me, I rely on my readings of Reinhart Koselleck and Ian Hacking, from the fields of philosophy of history and philosophy of (human) science respectively. Maybe because there I find the optimistic ironical twist in the ideas of Foucault (something I can identify with). They suggest that historical concepts and human kinds change meaning over time while applied in practice, and at the same time stem from particular cultural and historical practices. Identity, especially when different meanings are found at different points in history, might very well be such a dynamic notion. Applied in different contexts it might mean and imply different things. Probably the personalist notion has changed since Erikson, according to different disciplines, contexts and interests. The concern with imposing one particular notion on other contexts -a kind of identity imperialism- then becomes a concern with the uncritical, essentialist and objectivist use of the term. In other words, a concern with psychology confirming a particular cultural status quo (Danziger 1999). However, the notion can also be assimilated by and adapted to a new cultural environment. There's a difficulty with psychological notions in determining whether they are imposed outside their jurisdiction, or are adopted in a new context. Most likely both processes occur simultaneously in some kind of co-construction or interaction. As Hacking (1995) explains, human kinds can also be self-attributed. Identity can be imported and transformed. The rebels rejecting identity, examples given by Matusov and Smith (2012), still have a sense of self, and adjust their own notion of 'identity'. Certainly, they provide a critical

reflection on social scientific terminology, but in Foucauldian terms, they are as liberated from identity as the hippies were from sexual repression. That is to say, in the rejection is the recognition. But then, as unavoidable it is to be subject to notions and their practices that we are involved in, it is also unavoidable that they change. And thus identity might stray from US middle class, as the internally contradictory imperative of having a choice (Valsiner 2012) in other circumstances is immediately confronted with impossibilities. Both concept and person will need to adapt upon crossing the border, and that is something we do all the time and with increased frequency in current globalised practices.

Thus, the attempts to objectify identity are likely to be in vain. The human and social sciences aim at moving objects, according to Hacking (1995). Also identity “is constantly in a process of construction and maintenance, and it can never be presented as if its essence has a static form” (Valsiner 2012). Assuming the volatile and organic reality the detrimental effects of an essentialist notion are avoided. We should be weary of a universalist psychology, but there are reasons to believe that such a discipline does not deal with (plu)reality anyway. “[D]irect questions about identity lead to its entification—which is a crystallized form of a process the role of which is to stay in a dynamic form.” So instead “identity needs to be studied as a process—not as a thing.” (Valsiner 2012). Hence, in virtue of a fruitful future debate, you can forget all I’ve written above: we need to talk not about a substantive identity, but about the verb identifying or identification, for example.

ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES

In expanding the vision of self away from identity some essence remains; Matusov and Smith suggest an anti-identity discourse in which a notion of self still stands. Taken from the work of Bakhtin it is a dialogical notion. Entering in dialogue are two aspects of self: the “soul” or I-in-the-eyes-of-others and “spirit” or I-for-myself. But there’s an “I” nonetheless, even though the conceptualization of Bakhtin requires a simultaneous focus on “soul” and “spirit”, and emphasizes that it does not concern a well-defined unit. “Rather, the self is a *distinct point of view on the world and on oneself*.” (Bakhtin, quoted by Matusov and Smith on p. 15).

Needing ‘selves’ to get out of an identity discourse in which the notion is understood as a kind of ‘selfhood’ is somehow contradictory. As the notion of personal identity is related to the notion of self (there might even be a genealogical relation), formulating alternative notions of one using the other is not a Foucauldian thing to do. The ‘self’ does not escape genealogical analysis and is subject to the same anti-essentialist critique. Matusov and Smith are very aware of that, and make a clear distinction between genealogically analyzing ‘identity’ and suggesting alternatives. Yet, maintaining the notion of self, characterizing it in a dialogical way and emphasizing self-

determination, is similar to the attempts of many other scholars to make the notion of identity more flexible. The anti-discourse does not eradicate what lies underneath, but rather confirms a particular 'self'-ish notion of identity. More interesting is their suggestion to study "*when, to whom, and why* people talk about themselves" (p.15).

Indeed, an interesting alternative approach might be unhooking identity from selfhood by looking at the actions of identification and identifying. Rochat (2009) argues, in line with Mead (1934) and similar to Bakhtin's argument, that our being able to reflect upon ourselves, develops from our interaction with others. We know ourselves (or become our own subject, paying lip-service to Foucault) through the eyes of others. If there were no others there would be no need to identify ourselves, or to present ourselves consistently, in Bakhtin's words. If self-consciousness is incorporating how others see us, then identity might not be a matter of self-awareness (or "spirit") but rather a crystallization of an action of others towards us. That is, the act of identification or identifying. Often we start identifying ourselves after others have presented us with (variations of) the question 'who are you?'. Equally often we forget that we also impose this question on others. In our demographic curiosity we continuously demand their 'identity', understood in terms of gender, age, nationality, profession etcetera. As if we are all working at customs, and hardly allowing for flexible self-understandings, complex narratives or relational experiences. These concerns have become particularly vivid after living abroad for many years. The question 'where are you from?' still repeats itself, and has gradually become as boring as its answer is little informative. I'm probably more of an ongoing collection of experiences with many different people and contexts than representative of my country of birth. So I propose those who insist to ask me any other question that might reveal something about me, as long as it isn't a typical one. Knowing that I cannot pick a favorite color, is more telling than any standard category. Indeed, it is in the practices of categorizing others (and categorizing ourselves in their terms, often voluntarily, but also because societies demand us to) that identity limits the "soul". Reflecting upon our own actions of identification and identifying might provide an excellent opportunity to start to know others as continuously moving; meanwhile realizing that our act of knowing (also in the human and social sciences) is dynamic in itself.

Matusov and Smith propose a Foucauldian liberation from identity, and (apart from the question whether this is even possible) this might be interpreted as confronting the third person imperative on ourselves. But then we should not impose on others either. A Russian attributing a fake smile to an American is doing exactly the same thing as an American characterizing Russian identity. Looking further into 'identification' we might find a sameness in how we act towards each other, reflect and open up for other ways of understanding. To understand others in movement, or studying identity as a process, might involve letting go of standard (social

scientific) categories all together, as they tend to crystallize. More interesting, however, is to study why we crystallize and how the practices of identification (in the human and social sciences, at international airports, in job interviews, in promoting a bill, in appealing to our rights) fix identities; how they are simultaneously cherished and contested and in their sheer variety and plasticity might never be the same again. Indeed, the authors have succeeded in stirring the debate.

4.

THE COMPLEX CONSTRUCTION OF IDENTITY REPRESENTATIONS AND THE FUTURE OF HISTORY EDUCATION¹³

Collective memory, as Maurice Halbwachs (1992) already noted, is everywhere. The enormous diversity shaping our narratives and identities also characterizes the variety of approaches in the last section of this volume. History education forms only a small part of our consciousness of the past. Particularly when recent history is concerned, the transmission of beliefs from one generation to the next is beyond education. Nonetheless, school history “too often acts as if it is the only player” (Wineburg, Mosborg, Porat & Duncan, 2007). Mainly the (distant) national past is being taught and typically other ‘voices of collective remembering’ (Wertsch, 2002) are left out. However, the burgeoning research in the collective processes surrounding history education has opened up a field of interest impossible to ignore, vast in extension and complexity. Especially because “a common past [...is...] perhaps *the* crucial instrument—in the construction of collective identities in the present” (Seixas, 2004, p.5).

The four contributions in this section consider different aspects of the construction of representations as a complex process that is influenced by at least four major psychological and social factors: (a) family and social group considerations; (b) knowledge transmitted in the school environment, especially in the subjects of history, geography, religion and art; (c) the general media, especially the press and the audio-visual media of cinema and television; and (d) patrimony as the setting for the presentation of historic events that relate to identity. These social mechanisms make individuals aware of historical knowledge that influences the identity construction process. The four contributions in this section provide a critical reflection on the social and personal representation processes; the authors base their analyses on previous investigations and empirical studies on the construction of social and historical memory.

The contributions all highlight the complexity of the representation process and its less intuitive aspects, which will require further investigation in the near future. A clarification of these processes may elucidate mechanisms for analyzing social situations, which can facilitate plans for inclusive and multicultural education and governance. Simultaneously, these processes can reveal certain manipulations of social and cultural representations with ulterior motives, which is an important task.

¹³ Co-authored with Mikel Asensio and published as a Commentary on Section 5 - Collective Memories and Representations of Past and Future - in M. Carretero, M. Asensio and M. Rodriguez-Moneo (Eds.) (2012), *History education and the construction of national identities* (pp. 347-359). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

The complexity of representation and identification might be illustrated by recent research among participants in the Nicaragua revolution (Asensio & Pol, in preparation). Some findings will be presented and discussed in the light of issues raised in this section by Valsiner (2012), Moller (2012), Murakami (2012), and Haste and Hogan (2012). Similar to the research by Murakami and Moller (see also Wineburg et al., 2007; and Bietti, 2010), recent history is involved. The interviewed were themselves part of the historical process under study. Note that in these cases identification processes are clear and immediate; however, they might differ from those relating to the distant past. Something to consider, particularly with respect to history education. The relevant question, in the context of this volume, as to what the complexities of collective memory and identity construction imply for history education will be discussed. School history is a mere fragment of vast collective memory and can impossibly account for all of it. But as history is taught in a developmental period crucial for the construction of representations and identities, shouldn't it at least be opened up for other possible accounts?

IDEAS REGARDING THE PERCEIVED CONSTRUCTION OF SOCIAL REPRESENTATIONS OF HISTORICAL KNOWLEDGE OF IDENTITY

The following excerpts come from recent anthropological interviews in Nicaragua, in the context of a request from the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Nicaragua to evaluate the possible creation of a museum about the (Sandinista) revolution.¹⁴ Participants are Sandinista ex-guerrillas who are between 45–55 years old and were very young during the revolution (1979). The entire sample is of a peasant origin, including individuals from families with very low social and educational levels. The respondents have clear indigenous origins, although they do not belong to any of the country's indigenous minorities that are recognized as differentiated groups. Ideologically, they continue to be Sandinistas, although they hold various degrees of criticism about the revolutionary process. They are especially critical of the official Sandinista representatives, who recently won the general elections and the presidency of the country. The respondents are from León, which in 1979 was the first city to be liberated by the revolution after heavy periods of armed confrontation between the guerrillas and civilian population and the dictatorship. All of the respondents except one maintained various levels of political activity

¹⁴ Referring to the process of overthrowing the dictatorship of the Somoza presidential family by the *Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional*, FSLN, or the Sandinista National Liberation Front. Work that can be consulted for more historical detail is:

- Cabezas, O. (1999) *La montaña es algo más que una gran estepa verde*. [The mountains are more than just vast green steppes.] Tafalla, Spain: Editorial Txalaparta.
- Ortega, H. (1980) *50 años de lucha sandinista*. [50 years of Sandinista struggle.] Managua, Nicaragua: Editorial de Ciencias Sociales.
- Zimmerman, M. (2003) *Carlos Fonseca Amador y la revolución sandinista*. [Carlos Fonseca Amador and the Sandinista revolution.] Bluefields, Nicaragua: Universidad de las Regiones de la Costa Caribe Nicaragüense.

in left-wing parties, unions or associations. All of the respondents view themselves as Sandinista revolutionaries, and they consider their guerrilla past and their political activity to be the most important elements of their social identities (Asensio and Pol, in preparation).

Our history has always been poorly told because newspapers and television channels were constantly lying ... Because they are in the hands of the landholding rightwing.... During the revolution, they told the poor peasants that we guerrillas used to eat their daughters and that we were going there to destroy the little that they had, and the poor people believed it. The 'contras' (counter-revolutionary guerrillas) had a lot of money because they were paid by the United States, but it was never a real threat, they were in the mountains, but they served for those who were on the inside to put a brake on the revolution, to prepare a discourse ... the people did not know who we really were, what we wanted to do, because no newspaper or radio station was telling them. ... The children in school were not studying the revolution, they were studying what was then called "civil war," and it was not a civil war, everyone had risen up against the dictator, including now, today, in this city, the Front received more than 90% of the votes, everyone had voted Sandinista. Children ought to study with books that tell the truth. ... It is true that there are families that are not Sandinistas, the contras did a lot of damage, and they made mistakes. Right here we have a politician who is suspected of indiscriminate killing of indigenous people. ... We need a museum of the revolution so that in the future they will know what we tried to do that will tell what happened, and that will recover the places where things happened, because León is the city of the revolution, and the museum ought to be here, and this is the right moment.

The social and historical reality discussed here illustrates, in the first person and in a radical and dramatic fashion, the central aspects of identity construction. First, when listening to these individuals, one observes an important difference in relation to other Latin American countries. The traditional European-indigenous dialectic continues to influence their reflections on personal and social identity. However, although indigenous cultural influences are very strong in Nicaragua, they are only mentioned as exclusion factors to refer to particular minorities; indigenous cultural influences are not mentioned when the respondents refer to themselves. A similar pattern emerges with reference to the cultural influence of the colonial past; the majority of the interviewees do not use a colonial history to define their identity.

Potentially as a result of the revolutionary and contra-revolutionary wars, the participants' social identities revolve around the definition of their need to self-identify, as a key aspect of daily survival. Interestingly, it is common to meet people who identify themselves as revolutionaries. However, it is rare to meet people who identify themselves as counter-revolutionaries. Instead, one finds that the revolutionary factor is relevant to the degree of the

bitter critiques of the revolutionary process, including its excesses and leaders. However, one cannot distinguish an identity factor that is sufficiently agglutinating or explicitly recognized as being counter-revolutionary.

INTUITIVE FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE THE CONSTRUCTION OF IDENTITY

The phrases cited above combine some of the patterns that guide the process of personal identity in a significant way. All of the participants explicitly recognize that identity is a complex process that is influenced by internal and external aspects. The participants' implicit-intuitive theory is based on the idea that aspects of identity involve a personal attitude that depends on individual decisions but is strongly influenced by social context. For example, interviewees explain their identification with the revolutionary process in the context of two factors. They consider the socio-political context in which they lived during the war, which necessarily led to the conscientization of an unjust social situation. For example, they indicate that "it was the only thing that one could do in that situation" and that "anyone who had lived through it" would have done the same thing. They suggest that "it provided its own context" that determined their actions. However, they also mention their personal decision and commitment to change their situation, regardless of the personal cost, and to achieve a set of social improvements related to values of social solidarity. For example, they mention that "there were people who did not want to struggle" and that "some did not want to defend the interests of all but merely their own." Their theory includes a condition that applies to people who have lived through an experience that they consider to be definitive. For the respondents, phenomenal awareness is central for establishing an identity-based reality, whether as an inclusive factor ("if you lived it, then you would have a strong level of identification") or an exclusive factor ("if you did not live it, then it would be very difficult to have the same level of identification").

However, their implicit-intuitive theory also includes the prediction of what occurs in the absence of personal experience. When identity does not depend on personal experience, the factors of social transmission are fundamental, and those with experience suspect that there has been identity manipulation. The individual psychological factor is regarded as a predisposition that is related to family ("you belong to a family of revolutionaries or to a family of the right, or you have a family member who is relevant and significant in one direction or the other") or social group influence (especially environments for socialization) rather than a personal choice. In addition to this influence, much importance is placed on two determining social factors: education and media influence.

Education is considered to be a central factor in identity formation. Interviewees believe that school transmits certain biases that depend on the political choice of one's educational

background, such as public, private or religious. The biases are explicitly transmitted in assignments in history, religion, geography, art and literature and the social sciences. To the same degree, interviewees insist that the media directly and decisively influenced the construction of identities that are related to the revolution. The newspapers and radio networks play an important role, whereas television plays a secondary role because of its lower level of development. Paradoxically, this understanding is currently being inverted in the process of re-reading identity, which is discussed below.

Finally, heritage is another determining factor for identity. The value of material and intangible cultural features, together with natural heritage, shape a central element of identity by converting heritage into the most important element of historical memory. Heritage appears in our conversations as the determinant of identity through a process of establishing benchmarks that guarantee the survival of identity values. This reference value makes heritage relevant for establishing identities. Thus, the conservation and enhancement of heritage is a priority for social groups that identify with a particular ideal. Respondents explicitly consider heritage to be laden with cultural and social meaning as well as self-identification. In addition, its reference value plays a determining role that other forms of social influence do not guarantee; heritage contains a greater projection of the future than a textbook or documentary, which are ephemeral.

Most of the interviewed subjects explain the need to recover heritage sites that are related to the revolution. They consider the creation of a museum of the revolution as a priority for repairing and safeguarding their revolutionary identity. They also support the collection of personal material from homes, such as recordings of personal narratives. This attachment to the past represents a normal attitude in collectives that feel as though they are losing their material culture. Kyoko Murakami (2012) also provides a clear example.

THE CONSTRUCTION OF IDENTITY AS A PROCESS OF RE-INTERPRETING THE FUTURE

Representations of identity are often considered to be constructions from and for the past. This view exists in academic studies and can also be found in the intuitive views of the respondents. However, the construction of identity is for the individual in question, and it concerns the future. A person expects to identify with what that individual wishes to be. Identity always has a teleological component that, until now, has been seldom studied. Something also prioritized by Haste and Hogan (2012). Our interviewees are very clear about this “future” component. In a reiterative manner, they are concerned about two issues. First, they are directly concerned about promoting their future image. They are aware that the manipulation of the social environment, the media, their education and their heritage are central for ensuring that their

identity is understood and preserved as an end in itself. Second, they are concerned about the process of construction, and an explicit recognition of this process exists at the intra-subject level (which is in evident danger of a historical manipulation of these representations).

The implicit-intuitive theory is sensitive to processes of re-reading and rewriting, both internally and externally, the identity process. The affected persons are aware of these problems in terms of what they consider to be internal deviations or direct external constructions that come from various “aggressions” of the factors cited. The greatest influence comes from the media. It is easy to identify external aggressions from “the other” as having interests that are contrary to their own identity. All of the interviewees mention the re-writing of the revolutionary period that is occurring at present. This re-writing includes various factors, but it fundamentally involves the media, such as television, documentaries and historical re-creation series. These interesting re-writings provoke a re-reading of the individual identity processes. The most dangerous aspect of these changes is the lack of awareness of those affected because the mechanisms of influence are not transparent to the epistemological identity processes. For example, when referring to outside influences, respondents report that “It is incredible because people believe what the media tell them all over again.”

These processes of re-interpretation produce an indirect relationship between influential factors and the construction of representations of identity. For the media and other social agents, a re-reading of the past does not always involve the same re-readings by people, but it provokes reactions that are difficult to foresee. Many people who are subjected to an intense rereading do not change their positions, and the re-readings reinforce their identities and isolate them in an intense endogamic process. The process is often impenetrable from social or gregarious points of view because the processes of identity construction are not usually transparent. As becomes clear in the contributions of this final section. All agree that education is essential, especially given biased information in the media. Dealing with diversity in that context is, however, easier said than done.

COMPLICATIONS FOR HISTORY EDUCATION

How can education be organized given the complexity of identity construction processes? Or more concretely: should we take collective memories and identity construction into account in history education? Considering the case of Nicaragua we are inclined to say yes, as official and media accounts are limited and biased. Other perspectives, the history of the revolutionaries, should also be included. If a child cannot identify with the master narrative told at school, because her community was not represented in that historical account, we feel that a voice has been smothered and that human rights are violated. The issue of including indigenous histories

is discussed in more detail by Seixas (2012). Yet on the other hand we have been warned about how collective memories can obscure a clear vision of the past, or rather, how the emphasis on identification in history education might limit a disciplinary understanding of the past (Carretero & Bermudez, 2012). To allow collective memories in the history classroom might actually set the stage for a limited and biased national history, excluding indigenous communities, to be taught. However, the question posed above is not a very good one: collective memory is the context framing history education and the latter is already intertwined with processes of identity construction.

Collective memory and history are often referred to interchangeably in the ongoing debate on education and identity construction. Particularly the school history aimed at fostering (national) identities can be seen as an elaborate form of memory (Rüsen, 2007, as quoted by Moller, 2012). More often than not collective memories are transmitted through history teaching in and out of school (Carretero, 2011). They are not the same as the teachings of disciplinary history. As Carretero, Rosa and González (2006) have signaled school history is more but also less than historiography. It involves many more values and beliefs, not only the ones stressed by teachers, curricula or textbooks, but also those brought into the classroom by the students themselves (Grever, 2012; Tutiaux-Guillon, 2012). As it has been argued by Wineburg (2001) their often presentist psychological mindset can pose limits on complex historical understanding. This limitation is not essentially individual: children are very early on exposed to collective memories and national history, so the bias they present could be a consequence of the stories they were told and the way in which this happened. Carretero (2011) observes that participation in patriotic rituals, the acting out of national history, seems to significantly determine later historical narrative consumption, production and identification with that narrative. But then again, national history is more collective memory than disciplinary historiography.

History and memory both imply some consciousness of the past. And they do not merely involve passive reception of stories from the past in the present, but also active construction of narratives. Yet, what past we are aware of, and the way we are aware of it, differs when we are remembering or when we are historicizing, according to Rosa (2006). He distinguished between on the one hand an individual faculty that is practical and capable of imagining or forgetting what has happened in function of the present. Remembering, or not, can also happen collectively, and constitutes both a personal and a social identity. It establishes the continuity needed in the face of ambiguity. On the other hand there's the disciplined and contemplative practice of generating 'true' knowledge, following the rational criteria conventionally agreed upon by experts (Rosa, 2006; see also Wertsch & Roediger, 2008). A historian remembers, but ideally does not forget what is less convenient or desirable: he confronts historical sources that

might reveal particularly uncomfortable features of the past. Identification with that history is more likely to generate shame than to foster pride. Disciplinary history provides tools for national (self)critique, but would be equally critical of attempts by local minorities or ethnic communities to legitimize present interests. Thus, managing memory and history in the educational context is far from easy, particularly because education is concerned with both emancipation (of identities) and (disciplined) contemplation. Indeed, in practice memory and history can hardly be separated.

Yet conflicts emerge between collective memory and disciplinary history, as illustrated by Moller (2012). She investigated whether family recollections might hinder the learning of history. In the discussion between German students about the former GDR, it becomes pretty clear that the familiar variant of collective memory determines their view of the past. But instead of emphasizing authoritative history and its tools for enhancing historical literacy, Moller argues wisely: "When treated as distortions of the truth, family memories become an obstacle to history education. Instead, we should help students recognize they are a very specific source in a universe of possible other sources. While such a source can have a powerful impact on our orientation in time, like all sources it can be integrated into the bigger picture, using responsible and systematic reasoning." (p. 16)

Emphasizing the authority of historians might actually generate the idea of limited historical understanding: I (agent of disciplined history) know more than you (often a novice or agent of collective memory). Instead of judging collective memories from a historical point of view, these memories might in their own terms provide the necessary checks and balances for avoiding one potentially dangerous all-encompassing narrative. For example, in the case of Nicaragua Sandinista-accounts strike a balance with an official history. Historians, we've seen for example in Berger (2012), haven't been perfectly neutral. Collective memory could serve the diversity of perspectives that so many working and researching in the field of history education are actually looking for.

In line with this argument, Murakami (2012) makes an interesting suggestion, be it rather on a methodological level. Starting from an historical event as organizing individual experiences, she writes, you arrive at different historical contents than when you start the other way around: plotting individual experiences and other historical actors. The narrative arising from this network, most likely chaotic and dynamic, might actually be closer to how things happened than the narrative organized around a historical criterion, often set in presentism anyway. In the same vein it would be interesting to look at the historical concepts social scientists themselves use, organizing their discourse and possibly that of students as well. Thus 'nation' can become a

tool or leitmotiv while constructing a narrative, without a student necessarily being a nationalist: he is just using the tool available to him.

Valsiner (2012) proposes a similar idea in terms of a Semiotic Demand Setting: a field of meaning making wherein we all operate that determines what we can and cannot talk about. History writing he conceives of as a negotiation of meaning, and a construction of cultural tools with a certain objective: framing what is talked about. This establishes monuments in our minds, for example stable identities. Not only does this mean that the dynamic identity process goes unaccounted for, but also that talking about one thing is concealing another. Indeed, collective memory is vulnerable for forgetting, but in Valsiner's view, so is history.

Murakami too warns against forgetfulness. Yet she is optimistic about discursive practices geared towards the future and stresses the openness needed for history education. For her history is laden with future possibilities of being otherwise. Valsiner, however, shows the paradoxical nature of talking about openness. 'Having a choice' *determines* that you have choices, and what choices you have. And it's worse, talking prevents actual action. He is not just optimistic and states that the reality in history is always ambiguous; progress for some is regress for others. History teaching has a very important role to play, as it can either enable the view of social innovation or attempt to render it untenable (p. 16). Indeed, Sandinista accounts can be included in Nicaraguan history education. This can both be maintained from historiographic discipline, to counteract forgetfulness, as from collective memory, to include other voices. Or it can remain left out, from a disciplinary point of view because it's tendentious, and from a collective memory point of view because it jeopardizes national unity. History thus has myriad ways towards the future.

Although, the idea of past determining present determining future is turned upside down by Haste and Hogan (2012). In their discussion of civic agency they maintain that one can be optimist or pessimist about the future, feeling agency or not, trusting institutions or not, and this can frame our narratives. Ideas about continuity or change connect future, present and past. The students interviewed "make sense of their present, and give meaning to the past in the way that they story the future." (p. 2) In Valsiner's terms we are still just talking here, whether future fantasies actually result in engagement is not certain. But here we might find a criterion for an educational agenda, other than the opposing objectives of history teaching that we are currently juggling with. History education is built on aiming at romantization or enlightenment of the past, on identification or on disciplinary criticism (Carretero, 2011; Carretero & Bermudez, 2012). Particularly when legitimizing our present practices with (biased) narratives about the past, we can hardly maintain to teach for the future. Shouldn't we focus ahead of us instead?

The argument that we should educate for the future is often heard (Murakami, 2012; Grever & Stuurman, 2008). Not an easy task, when the future is hardly predictable. And, just as in turning to the past, there should be clarity about what future, and for whom? (Rosa, 2006, 2012). It seems that every time there's some major contemporary political or economical change school history curricula are adapted (Carretero, Rosa, & González, 2006; Foster, 2012). The teaching of history, unavoidably, happens every time from a different present. Thus education slugs behind contemporary developments. We cannot foresee new historical knowledge that might change historiographical content. We cannot foresee the society to which our students will have to be prepared. And can we really know what history, or even if history, matters for their future?

In the face of an uncertain future identities are constructed, that at the same time help to make sense of the past. Our identities are framed every time anew in the dynamics of collective memory, present experience and future interests. No one definition seems possible, complicating significantly research efforts and educational implications. If we learn one thing from this section, and even the whole book, it's that there are multiple perspectives on multiple subjects, and that there's a strong relation between what we look at, and how we look at it (see also Wertsch & Roediger, 2008). A cultural psychologist looks at an individual using tools available to him. A discursive psychologist looks at the discourse we engage in. A history educator looks at how conscious or literate of history we are. A civic educator looks at how well our agency as civilians is developed. The common denominator is collective memory as a dynamic process relating past, present and future in complex ways. Collective memories can be situated between (or behind) selves and others, between us and them, between recent and distant past, between what will be remembered and what will be forgotten. They are defined and redefined depending on what needs prevail. Making those explicit is not the easiest enterprise while one identity divides into many and many nations dissolve into one. Moreover, now that we live in a world faced with uncertainties, there's a stronger revindication of the present through the past, making memory and history more vulnerable for conservatism and indoctrination. However, if education is in any way directed at future generations it should not be legitimizing the status quo but open up alternative possibilities. Whether it's trying to account for as many different identities as possible, or wanting to foster critical historical awareness. And ultimately the student will have to see for herself, so why not let her start investigating straight away?

It's an important task to clarify our multiplicity and this section gives us the necessary variety in directions for further exploration of how history, memory, identity and narrative are intertwined. Just as important is sharing the responsibility, and to consider what it really means to open up for future generations. Being otherwise also involves serious self-criticism. For social

scientists and educators this means being critical of ourselves and our role in establishing semiotic settings. We should be weary of justifying our own discipline in the views that we propagate and concepts we continue to use, as this would mean participation in the very process so many of us are criticizing.

5.

HISTORY, COLLECTIVE MEMORIES OR NATIONAL MEMORIES? HOW THE REPRESENTATION OF THE PAST IS FRAMED BY MASTER NARRATIVES¹⁵

In this chapter we argue that the nation, as both a conceptual and narrative unit, greatly formats collective memories and history learning. By conceptual unit we mean an abstract entity that integrates different social and political elements (like population and territory) and generates a particular view of the past, not necessarily related to historical processes as such. By narrative unit we mean the nation as the center and subject of historical narration. In both the collective production of accounts of the past and their individual consumption, national historical master narratives are pervasive. We consider master narratives as general patterns of imagining the nation, as seen for example in the myths of the origin of nations or narratives of national struggle or progress. According to Heller (2006) they serve as a general unit of analysis not only in psychology but in the social sciences in general. National master narratives act as both official and general interpretations of the past but also legitimize the present and set an agenda for the future.

To clarify our argument, we will first reflect on the relation between memory and history. These fundamentally different ways of representing the past become entangled in national history. After a contemporary example of how collective memory is framed by national experiences, we turn to the role of history education in this process. We will discuss our empirical work that indicates the predominance of national master narratives over representation. And finally it is suggested that disentangling history from memory, to critically interrogate the national narratives, might help expanding collective memory beyond national memory.

MEMORY AND HISTORY AS REPRESENTATIONS OF THE PAST

The relation between memory and history is complex. Ricoeur argues that memory is “the womb of history” (2004, p. 87), that is, history as a discipline heavily relies on testimonies. Even though the archives are a collective resource allowing the systematic investigation we call history, the testimonies that make up the archive rely on individual memories. Nevertheless, history is more than a kind of memory, it is “organized memory” (Le Goff, 1992). A notion such as “historical consciousness” (Rüsen, 2004) integrates history and memory as sources for identity, and is very useful for thinking about how we commonly understand the past. However, we adhere to what

¹⁵ Co-authored with Mario Carretero and to be published in B. Wagoner (Ed.) *Oxford Handbook of Culture and Memory*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

might be called a “hyperdialectic” (Polkinghorne, 2005), an ongoing dialectic without synthesis, in which individual memory, collective memory and history are different parts of a process of representing the past.

Memory, individually speaking, is the capacity to remember (Rosa, 2006) or “existential work” (Le Goff, 1992). In terms of autobiographical memory it is important for our personal identities. Individual memory has been primarily studied as a cognitive function in a wide range of sub-categories, from autobiographical and semantic to procedural memory (Tulving & Craik, 2000). Therefore it is mainly related to individual perception and experience. Remembering also happens at a collective level, as a scaffold to collective identities and for many other (political) purposes. However, beyond metaphorical confusion, the collective does not experience or perceive the same way as does an individual. Nor does collective memory always refer to a collective experience. Often events are collectively remembered that the individual member of the collective or the present collective itself has never witnessed. Wertsch (2002) illustrates the difference between individual and collective memory based on studies of state dependent retrieval, showing that memory is more accurate when the individual state of mind at the time of retrieval is similar to the state of mind at the time of encoding. In this sense talking about a collective state of mind and collective encoding is nonsensical, particularly because the collective is not a clearly defined organism situated in time and space. Collective memory is not a cognitive capacity but a practice that exists in objects collected in museums, monuments erected and collective narratives told. This means that it transcends time and space. Here cultural tools play a clear role, and may also help to make a case for how collective and individual memory are connected (Wertsch, 2002; this volume).

According to Ricoeur (2004), the individual capacity to remember is connected to practices of collective remembering through a complex process of selecting and sharing testimonies. For Halbwachs (1992) this relation is inversed: individual thought is capable of recollection because it is embedded in social frameworks for memory and participates in collective memory. As cultural psychologists we can affirm that memory becomes interiorized through cultural means. In contrast, Ricoeur might argue that these collective means come from individual testimonies. Indeed, one could wonder whether witnessing is culturally mediated or a matter of perceptive mechanisms, or both. Nevertheless, when Ricoeur states that “history will offer schemata for mediating between the opposite poles of individual memory and collective memory” (2004, p. 131) he coincides with the position of cultural psychology (Wertsch, 1998; 2002). We agree that individual and collective memories are in a continuous and complex interaction. This is also indicated by Brockmeier (2010) in his exhaustive review of cognitive research on memory. He strongly criticizes the idea of “archive” as the key metaphor of memory, based on various trends

of the present field. We think that both memory and collective memory are mainly mediated by narrative, in which the relation between past, present and future play an important role (Carretero & Solcoff, 2012). But we should not let a 'narrative imperialism' (Bamberg, 2011) make us believe that either kind of memory is reducible to the other. Nor is history just narrative, or reducible to collective memory.

Remembering, individually or collectively, is at the same time forgetting (Ricoeur, 2004; Rosa, 2006). To constitute an individual or group as being the same through time, thus establishing its identity, is to tell a narrative (Ricoeur, 1992). A classic narrative has one protagonist. It describes certain selected events relevant for the protagonist while leaving others out. Forgetting, however, is something that the disciplinary investigation of the past tries to avoid (Rosa, 2006). Of course historians make mistakes and can be manipulated or themselves be manipulative, but in their work both scientific and moral standards apply as truth values (Le Goff, 1992). Ideally, history does not forget and systematically investigates what memory leaves out, accidentally or on purpose. This can be done by not just looking at one testimony, but by comparing many of them. Weighing sources against each other, and letting present questions interact with different remnants from the past, is part of the "historian's craft" (Bloch, 1953). Bloch and his colleagues at the *Annales* School of history were key figures in what can be called 'new history' (Burke, 2001). Instead of simply declaring the end of all great stories and throwing the history baby out with the modern bathwater, new history allows the introduction of different perspectives and the continuation of critical historical investigation. As Burke (2001) suggests, the ideal narrative for new history would be the multiple perspective account that we find in contemporary literature (e.g. Lawrence Durrell's *The Alexandria Quartet*, 1962; or Milorad Pavić's *Dictionary of the Khazars*, 1988) and film (e.g. Kurosawa's *Rashomon*, 1950; or Fernando Meirelles' *Cidade de Deus*, 2002). In this way forgetful memory, or strategic history manipulation, can be confronted with different accounts. Collective memory can be a source of such an account, for example, when narratives of political militancy in Latin America counter the official version of national history propagated by the dominant oligarchy or military dictatorships (van Alphen & Asensio, 2012; Jelin, 2003). As could also be seen in the fall of the Soviet Union, 'popular archives' can correct 'official archives' (Le Goff, 1992). In short, memory offers accounts and testimonies; history systematically compares and investigates them. As will be discussed in this paper, Marxist ideas and experiences have on the one hand been collectively remembered as liberating by certain Latin American groups, and on the other hand these ideas have been represented as oppressing by Russian and Eastern European groups.

Note that national history is also a kind of collective memory, when it propagates a particular national group's - or its political elite's - story or point of view. If we look at the discipline of

history before new and multiple ways of doing history were introduced, we see that it was basically aimed at constructing national identities (Berger, 2012). In early history writing memory, identity and history were very much nationally entangled. History was national history, a very peculiar kind of collective memory, as the nation was basically invented (Hobsbawm & Ranger, 1983; Anderson, 1983). Other collective identities already existed, but national identity was new in the nineteenth century. National history was written to construct and legitimize this new identity, often rewriting significant parts of the past in national terms. Moreover, this history was developed in order to be taught, such that it could be used to make people into national citizens. With the rise of new history in the 20th century, and all the different perspectives offered also by collective memory, one might think that this is no longer the case. Yet, national identity has become so banal and naturalized (Billig, 1995) that it has invisible power over how people in societies remember. For example, how many times does the daily use of “we”, “us” or “here” refer to the nation? In the construction of historical accounts these tiny elements often indicate a restriction to national history or identity.

We will argue in this chapter that history, memory and identity are still very much framed in national terms. The national perspectives overpowering collective memory might even partly explain why history and memory are still being confounded, instead of acknowledging that there are in fact different kinds of histories and memories. Whereas contemporary historiography gives very critical accounts of nation (e.g. Hobsbawm & Ranger, 1983; Alvarez Junco, 2011; Rios Saloma, 2005), the common representation of the past is dominated by master narratives. This is a kind of narrative that celebrates the nation, its origins and its achievements, and generally functions to interpret the past in terms of a (national) group and its present goals. Taking a look at the educational process where historical accounts, collective and individual memories meet, is particularly illuminating for our argument. In the following, we will first reflect on how collective memory is framed with a contemporary example, and secondly explore the role of education in constructing frames for understanding the past.

WHAT FRAMES DIFFERENT COLLECTIVE MEMORIES OF THE SAME PAST?

Figure 1 shows a picture of students meeting in their School of Education in Guerrero, Mexico, on November 23, 2014.¹⁶ They are discussing protest actions in response to the disappearance of 43 fellow students on September 26, 2014.¹⁷ These most likely violently abducted students were protesting against discrimination and other forms of political violence that defenders of

¹⁶ Retrieved 18-12-2014 from:

http://internacional.elpais.com/internacional/2014/10/17/actualidad/1413568451_060339.html

¹⁷ See: http://elpais.com/elpais/2014/11/10/inenglish/1415647071_871493.html

Accessed on 18-12-2014

human rights endorse. The incredible incident has produced the most important political scandal in Mexico in recent years. As can be seen, images of Marx, Engels and Lenin are part of the permanent political symbols at this School. The well-known phrase of Marx's thesis on Feuerbach is included in the image. It is an image very similar to those found in many places throughout Latin America. Plausibly, the presence of these images indicates that for this particular political movement, and probably many others in Latin America, Marxist and revolutionary characters are very influential in their interpretation of the past. For a majority of the Latin American youth, Marxist symbols and characters are no doubt representative or models in resisting political oppression, economic exploitation and violation of human rights. In this vein it is important to consider that the Marxist *weltanschauung* has traditionally maintained history as a social scientific support of its grand narrative of progress and emancipation, ultimately carried out by the Russian revolution. It is very likely that this grand narrative is being represented on the Mexican mural in Figure 1. It is present in almost the same way in the famous Diego Rivera 1925 murals, on the walls of the ancient Mexican Secretary of Education in Mexico City.



Figure 1. Mexican students of Education in a meeting about civil rights. The mural is quoting Marx: "Until now philosophers have only interpreted the world. What is necessary is to transform it."

However, if we compare the image in Figure 1 with the numerous images showing the destruction of Marxist monuments all over the former Soviet Union immediately after the collapse of communism (see Figure 2), questions immediately arise. For example, how is it possible that Mexican students consider Lenin and Marx as cultural and political models of liberation and at the same time in other parts of the world these characters represent oppression? (See also Ahonen, 1997, for an analysis of the changes in history education in the former GDR after the fall of the Berlin wall; and Wertsch & Rozin, 2000, showing how former soviet citizens did not consider the Russian revolution a grand narrative at all.)



Figure 2. Destruction of a Lenin statue in the Ukraine.

Both representations are based more on collective memories than on historiographical research. As was stated before, collective memories involve selective forgetting. Something that can also happen in a historiographical endeavor, but the latter at least aims at systematically avoiding forgetfulness. For example, very recent contributions (Snyder, 2012) have shown how Soviet regimes were characterized by an enormous repression of political adversaries and citizens in general, had an alliance with the Nazi regime and produced more than 11 million victims. This is clearly “forgotten” by the Mexican students. But at the same time it can be argued that the massive destruction of Marxist monuments “forgets” the systematic repression of Marxist political leaders and citizens in general by military regimes in Latin America, often supported by the government of the United States of America (see for example Jelin, 2003, on the collective memory of political violence during the 70’s in South America). In short, it is clear that collective memories are basically contextual and to some extent reactive. In other words, they appear in the context of a particular inherited social and political past. In this vein, Mexican students vindicate the revolutionary role of Marxist figures because these represent their attempt to gain emancipation and civil rights. They probably do not consider Marxist figures as symbols of oppression, because this has not been the case in their local and national experience. On their part, citizens from former communist countries see in monuments inspired by Marxism the oppression they experienced for decades in their specific societies. Historiographical research tries to maintain a broader view on social and political problems, and takes into account more than one perspective on the past. Collective memories, however, are contextual and local, and the most relevant social, cultural and political context for citizens is their own current national society.

Interestingly, these two divergent scenarios, Latin American countries and former communist societies, have something in common: the trend to base their history education and curriculum mostly on nationalist contents. In both cases a nationalist view of the past is taken to be perfectly compatible with a particular position regarding the Marxist-Leninist grand narrative. This

nationalist trend in history education has been analyzed in much detail (e.g. Ahonen, 1997; Carretero, 2011). For example, in Mexico students and teachers were demonstrating and on strike when the government tried to change school history contents through an educational reform in 1992 and 2000 (Carretero, 2011, chapter 2). These historical contents were mainly related to national figures, such as the *Child Heroes* who fought against the North American army. These children are popular heroes in Mexico, even though their actual role in the military conflict has not been well documented until now. The Mexican government tried to implement a new history curriculum, in which these and similar figures were not present anymore. The attempt to change the history curriculum, and to make it less nationalist, was perceived by a part of the citizenry as an assault on their collective memory. In another context, both Estonia and the former Democratic Republic transformed their history curricula radically after the collapse of the communism in order to base it on nationalist narratives and concepts (Ahonen, 1997). This trend is nowadays even stronger, taking into account the very nationalist and patriotic orientation adopted by Russia in the last years under president Putin (Levintova, 2010). In comparing these examples of how collective memories are framed by certain contexts, the contribution of contemporary disciplinary history to constructing multi-perspective accounts of the past can be clearly seen. On the other hand, particularly in the fall of the Soviet Union (Brossat, Combe, Potel & Szurek, 1992), the contribution of collective memory to history writing is very clear. As Le Goff formulates: “*Popular archives* can correct *official archives*, even though the latter can hide and therefore reveal some truths that have been kept a secret” (1992, p.16; our translation from Spanish version). Thus, collective memory and historiography combined can counteract the attempts of political, ideological or economical powers to use, subdue or manipulate history in their own interest (Le Goff, 1992).

THE ROLE OF HISTORY EDUCATION IN FRAMING THE PAST

Above collective memories and historiography have been compared as producers of representations of the past. However, formal and informal history education experiences, at the crossroads of collective memory and historiography, are essential to take into account in the construction of these representations. By formal history education we refer mainly to school history contents and activities. By informal history education we mean representations of the past that appear in patriotic rituals, museums and heritage. As we have analyzed elsewhere (Carretero, 2011, chapter 1) school history does not just consist of disciplinary historical knowledge. It is much influenced by collective memories, attitudes and other ideological aspects. So is historical research, even though ideally it compares perspectives instead of choosing one and forgetting another. Therefore historiography, collective memory and history education have a complex relation in which mutual interactions are frequent. Specifically considering history

education as a source of representation, and more generally considering cultural tools, a distinction has been made between production and consumption (Wertsch, 1998; 2002). The former refers to the produced cultural tools or elements of history education, such as textbooks, media, etc. The latter concerns the representation and use of cultural tools by students and citizens, or history learning. As will be later shown a specific interaction between these two processes takes place.

Regarding the production of representations about the past, different researchers have considered the existence of competing objectives of history education (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Wineburg, 2001). Carretero (2011) has redefined these objectives as “romantic” and “enlightened”, because their features and functions stem from their intellectual roots in Romanticism and the Enlightenment respectively. In that sense history has been taught in all national school systems so as to make students “love their country” (Nussbaum & Cohen, 2002) and to make them “understand their past” (Seixas, 2004). In a romantic vein, history education is a fundamental strategy used to achieve: (a) a positive assessment of the past, present and future of one’s own social group, both local and national, and (b) an identification with the country’s political history. In an enlightened vein, history education has aimed at fostering critical citizens’ capability of informed and effective participation in the historical changes happening nationally and globally. This can involve a critical attitude towards their own local or national community, or even larger political units. Recently this has been translated in several countries into the following disciplinary and cognitive objectives: (a) to understand the past in a complex manner, which usually implies mastering the discipline’s conceptual categories (Carretero & Lee, 2014); (b) to distinguish different historical periods, through the appropriate adequate comprehension of historical time (Barton, 2008); (c) to understand historical multi-causality and to relate the past with the present and the future (Barton & Levstik, 2004); and (d) to approach the methodology used by historians, such as comparing sources (Monte-Sano, 2010).

The romantic and enlightened goals of history education have coexisted from the very beginning of school history teaching and developed over time. The romantic goals were most influential from the 19th century until approximately 1960-70. A testimony from an academic historian, about how school history was taught in the middle of the last century, is telling:

As for myself, I still remember the moment when I first heard about the heroic end of the Numantines [the inhabitants of Numancia, a town in what currently is northern Spain, who resisted a Roman siege], at the hands of the evil foreigners who had besieged them.... I imagined the scene of a great bonfire in the middle of the town square, into which two warriors were throwing the jewels, the furniture, and the bodies of the children and women that had been put to the sword. They finally killed each other, so that the triumphant enemy

would capture neither slaves nor booty. This is how we Spaniards are, the teacher explained: we prefer to die rather than be slaves. We all felt horror, but also pride, and unconsciously resolved to do the same someday should the occasion arise.... It might be thought that a precocious interest in history is revealed by these stories, but that is not the case. Neither the former nor the latter were history; both were “school narratives”. (Alvarez-Junco, 2011, p. XVII).

As can be seen, the teaching of history was not so much inspired by academic research. However, it was very powerful and effective, probably because it was directed at the construction of collective identities and emotional attachment to these identities. It is not surprising that another academic historian declared, at the beginning of his classic book, that “Our images of other people, or of ourselves for that matter, reflect the history we a taught as children. The history marks us for life. Its representation.... of the past of societies, embraced all of our passing or permanent opinions, so that the traces of our first questioning, our emotions, remain indelible” (Ferro, 1984, p. vii).

Even nowadays history education in a number of countries is exclusively romantic and nationalist. Therefore, national histories “were born to be taught”. They are contained in a variety of records such as museums (Knell, Aronson, et al. 2011), monuments and patriotic celebrations important in many countries (Carretero, 2011, chapter, 4; Westheimer, 2007). After the 1960’s and 70’s, the disciplinary goals of history education became increasingly influential (Carretero & Bermudez, 2012). Social Sciences (Economy, Sociology, Anthropology) in general started to affect curricula in different countries. Included in history curricula disciplinary objectives were considered perfectly compatible with the romantic objectives. However, several studies (Carretero & Kriger, 2011; Lopez, Carretero & Rodriguez Moneo, 2014a) have indicated the tension this might generate in students’ representations. In colonial and postcolonial history teaching this becomes particularly clear. Spanish school textbooks have traditionally omitted essential features of the American colonization, such as the subjugation of indigenous people or slavery as a generalized social and economic practice (Todorov, 1997; Ferro, 1984-2002). Therefore, it could be said that aiming at “loving” the Spanish country has had serious consequences for understanding its colonial past. In contrast, these colonial issues are highlighted in Mexican or Brazilian textbooks (Carretero, Jacott & López-Manjón, 2002). Similar findings are reported when former colonizers and the colonized are compared in France/Algeria, Great Britain/India, China/Japan (Ferro, 1984-2002) and Japan/Korea (The Academy of Korean Studies, 2005).

These tensions are not only a matter of controversial issues in recent history. Remote history is at the bottom. That is, the historical issues at the roots of national identity construction are a

fundamental part of the problem. For this reason, it can be said that even nowadays historical master narratives are playing an important role in the imagination of the nation. They serve the romantic goals of history education particularly well. And their influence is becoming more widespread and more intense in the emergence of new nationalisms in Europe and other parts of the world. As Alridge (2006) and Straub (2005) have indicated, these “master narratives” of nation pervade underneath a variety of specific contents and through time. While specific narratives may change frequently, these underlying master narratives rarely change, and manifest once and again in subsequent revisions of history contents. Also out of school, in monuments, rituals, museums, films and other media a narrative of nation is perpetuated.

So far we have attended to the production or teaching of national history, or maybe rather national memories. However, do the conflicting views found in academic and public debates, and in school textbooks, influence how students and citizens ultimately understand the past? How do features of the social production of historical narratives translate into the processes of individual consumption of historical narratives? To these issues we turn now.

MASTER NARRATIVES AND THE REPRESENTATION OF THE PAST

Even though in history education and its investigation an emphasis on national history is found, this does not as of yet determine how people represent history. The narrative of the nation is a dominant account of history, in and out of school, but people can also turn to historiography or alternative accounts of collective memory. In the theory of mediated action there is an irreducible tension between the cultural tool, in this case the master narrative, and the agent who appropriates this narrative, the students and citizens that ‘consume’ accounts of history (see Wertsch, 1998, 2002). On the part of the appropriating agent there can be opposition to, or rejection of, accounts of history. We find a very clear example of this in the historians who reject the master narrative as a myth (Megill, 2007). Also collective memory, as in the experiences of a particular group of people, can resist and contribute alternative versions to “official” history. For example, Sandinista militants from peasant families in Nicaragua tell a very different story about the revolution in 1979 than the version propagated by the media and institutional powers (Van Alphen & Asensio, 2012). Both on the basis of historical research and on the basis of alternative collective memories, people can resist and reject the national master narrative. Precisely these processes of resistance are important to study, because they indicate the dynamic aspects of collective memories. In other words, they show how representations of the past change and generate new and different ways of remembering in both human beings and societies.

Nevertheless, research demonstrates that more often than not students’ representation of history, and of what is deemed important in history, is framed by the nation (Barton, 2008).

Furthermore, Wertsch (2002, this volume) suggests that schematic narrative templates, general narrative patterns that are found across specific narratives of historical events forming interpretation schemas in people's minds, are active when representing national history. Recent work, inspired by cultural psychology and history learning studies, indicates that the narratives that students construct about their own nation greatly resemble the national master narrative rather than a historiographical account of the national past. This has been found among university students in Spain (López, Carretero & Rodríguez -Moneo, 2014a) and high school students in Argentina (Carretero & Van Alphen, 2014). To study the representation of national history and the appropriation of master narratives in more detail Carretero (2011, chapter 4; Carretero & Bermúdez, 2012) has suggested a model of master narrative production and consumption that can be applied to different countries. This model distinguishes six different narrative characteristics or dimensions. In this vein, the investigation of students' representations has turned to analyzing whether these characteristics appear, constituting master narratives in students' minds. The master narrative dimensions are:

- 1) *A homogeneous historical and social subject*. That is, the narrative has one single subject that is homogeneous both in opposition to the historical other and over time. There is no variety or diversity of historical actors, and the subject has an idealized and timeless character. The establishment of this national protagonist, the main voice of the narrative, involves a process of inclusion/exclusion. For example, the voice of indigenous people living in the same territory is excluded from the national narrative.
- 2) *Identification processes*, in terms of a "we" versus "them" structure. The narrators either identify with the national historical subject, or "we" and "they" reflect a present national identity projected on the past, or identification is both historical and social. Past and present subjects are merged into one national identity, as are different social actors.
- 3) *Heroic and transcendent key historical figures*. These individuals appear in the narrative to represent national virtue and set the national example. They are valued positively and considered outside their social and historical context, as quasi-mythical characters.
- 4) *A monocausal or teleological account of the historical events*, in terms of one main goal such as the search for freedom or defending the national interest.
- 5) *Moral value judgments*, positive about the national subject and historical events, negative about the historical/national other. This national moral value is self-justifying or tautological: what is national is good, and the good is national. In this sense the sacrifices

made, from dying for your country to eradicating other groups and traitors, are for the greater good.

6) *An essentialist conceptualization of nation and national identity*, both are naturalized and timeless entities. In this sense territory is also essentialized as, or predestined to be, national.

How do these characteristics concretely manifest in students' representations? A recent study (Carretero & Van Alphen, 2014) gives us some examples. It investigated how Argentine urban middle class high school students represented the historical event that occurred in 1810, which nowadays marks the anniversary of the Argentine nation on the 25th of May. This event is therefore not just a part of Argentine national history; it represents the very beginning, a so-called *myth of origin* (Smith, 1991; Jovchelovitch, 2012), and constitutes an important theme in Argentine national narrative: independence. It can be compared to the Boston Tea Party in the U.S. and other histories of independence on the American continent (Ortemberg, 2013). Keeping the master narrative characteristics in mind we can take a look at two different student accounts.

Mario, 14 years old:

The Argentine people were tired of being governed by Spain. At that time there was a viceroy and the people went to overthrow him. They went to tell him that we were a free people.

Analía, 16 years old:

In the town hall, on May 25th, part of the Buenos Aires society held a reunion, to discuss about the government that had been in charge that was no longer legitimate, because Ferdinand VII [king of Spain] had been taken as a prisoner by Napoleon in Spain [...] and upon imprisoning him the Viceroyalty of River Plate, a Spanish colony of which our territory was part, because you cannot speak of Argentina at that time... the viceroy Cisneros, who was at that time the authority, was left without legitimacy. Some members of society, of the social upper class, decided that a meeting needed to be held urgently to dismiss that [Cisneros's] government and to form another based on the actual situation at that time.

Both Mario and Analía were asked to tell the interviewer about the same historical event. However, their accounts contrast dramatically with one another. Apart from transcendent heroes and explicit moral values, all master narrative characteristics can be found in Mario's version. There is a homogeneous historical subject, the Argentine people, opposed to another,

Spain. That Argentines are supposed to have existed, indicates the essentialized conceptualization of the nation and its nationals. The event was motivated by a desire to be free, or at the very least of being tired of foreign rule. Here we also see something of a value judgment. Through the use of “we”, a social identification process seems to be at work that at the same time is a historical identification process.

The four narrative characteristics are very much intertwined. The historical subject is homogeneous both in opposition to Spain and because of being essentially Argentine. The historical event is both caused by this opposition between the people and Spain, as well as by essentially being different from Spaniards. The national identity sits in the people’s need to be free and is affirmed by this freedom. This narrative coherence is not just a spontaneous feat of individual narrative thought nor is there a lack of learning. Mario has actually interiorized a collective memory: the master narrative of the origin of the Argentine nation. His account was learned as well as Analía’s, because he cannot arrive at such an account on the basis of his individual experience: something mediates his access to the distant past.

This is different for Analía. In her account Argentina does not exist in 1810. The people are not unified by a national identity in opposition to another, as Spanish colonists constituted Buenos Aires society and differences existed in their sociopolitical status. Only some participated in a Town Council meeting that was caused by an international chain of events. There was a need for legitimate government, preferably representing those very protagonists calling for a Town Council. One could say that Analía’s account reflects the other objective of history education: to understand the past. Her version unmistakably has a narrative structure although much closer to historiographical accounts (e.g. Chiaramonte, 1991). Actually, she studied the 25th of May 1810 as part of her high school history curriculum a year earlier. The Argentine history textbooks used are quite precise in historical detail, even though they emphasize national history like many other curricula and textbooks around the world.

The general results of the study, however, do not suggest that the representation of the national past differs between 8th and 11th graders as a function of history education. Even though a development towards history understanding in the 11th grade was found, some eighth graders did not manifest a master narrative representation and more than half of the eleventh graders did. Their representations were mediated by the master narrative, or by more historical accounts in different degrees. Therefore there is no single way of individually constructing the collective narrative. Yet the master narrative predominated overall, suggesting that some aspects of collective memory are hard to change (Carretero & Van Alphen, 2014). For example,

Clara, 16 years old:

It is a step we took to fight against the Spaniards so that they respect our rights, because that place was in itself our territory. All those years of subordination to the Spanish crown, with the viceroy and the king of Spain [...] we didn't need a government telling us what to do, if we want to be independent, we want to govern, we the Argentines.

In this fragment it can be seen how the establishment of an essentially national historical subject automatically, as a function of narrative coherence, involves and connects the other master narrative characteristics. There is identification with the national subject, its actions and supposed intentions. The territory essentially belongs to that subject and legitimizes a fight. The historical event, the fight, is inherently good because it was for independence, rights and political autonomy of the national historical subject. Some heroism is involved, even though no specific heroes are mentioned. Later on in the interview Clara does give credit to the Argentine national hero of independence, responding to the question *Was it Argentina that became independent?* : "Yes, because of San Martín."

The overall results suggest that the student's narrative representation is more or less coherent. When, in the case of Analía above, the historical subject is specified as urban political upper class, then the historical events are more contextualized. There is a narrative of nation, but the latter is understood in a long and complex historical process instead of a pre-existing collective essence. Tensions arise when the students hold on to the master narrative on the one hand and enter into more historical detail on the other. For example,

Luisa, 16 years old:

Actually, we can say that in the beginning the population was a mix of Spaniards and aboriginals and I believe that the majority of the population was Spanish. When the country developed and they saw that they could have... they had the possibility to have their own country and a president or whatever. I believe they saw a possibility to become independent and create... a revolutionary movement... but putting it like this you realize that the major part of the population was Spanish and because of that, they maybe wanted to become independent from Spain themselves.

Here we see that as soon as a somewhat more contextualized historical subject appears, the events ('revolution', 'independence') that logically followed from the opposition with Spain are not that logical anymore. The historical protagonists are themselves Spanish colonists and not nationally opposed to Spain. Luisa has some difficulty with connecting the dots as the master narrative representation is disturbed by another possible historical subject. This tension might very well be a consequence of the two objectives in history learning mentioned before. Other

research in Argentina (Carretero & Kriger, 2011) suggests that for the students there are tensions between master narrative and historical representations of nation, the same way that there are tensions between the two objectives of history education when it concerns the nation. Given the predominance of the master narrative, and its presence in the students' representations even after learning about the history of May 25th, we could say that the objective of constructing national identities is more successfully accomplished. Aiming at history understanding an educator would want students' representations to change, but they remain much restrained by the master narrative. In its wake historical details are forgotten, such as the fact that women, slaves, indigenous groups and creoles without political status in 1810 were not allowed into the Town Council. Can we therefore really talk about "the people" becoming "free"? Thirteen year old Manu is very skeptical:

The idea of feeling Argentine to me seems something theoretical. The country is formed, not natural, in any moment it can change names: we're 'argentines' and all of a sudden we can be 'troglodytes' (laughs). [...] I think it is kind of an egoist idea, in order for certain people to have power over society, and the rest of us we go along with those people so that they have the power and have more money, more dough. I think that for this reason the system of countries and of society in general is designed.

Interestingly, it was recently found that Spanish students, when telling about the origin of a nation that is not their own, do not construct a master narrative the same way they do about the Spanish nation (Lopez, Carretero & Rodriguez-Moneo, 2014b). Particularly, they do not demonstrate the moral judgments and territorial claims that arise when the own nation is concerned. They do manifest the first narrative characteristic: a national historical subject is established. In the case of this recent investigation the historical subject was Greek. Even though the historical subject was not Spanish like these students, it was considered to be essentially and homogeneously Greek. This also suggests that the core dimension of the master narrative is its national historical subject, whether students identify with this subject or not.

MASTER NARRATIVES IN (RE-EN)ACTION

We argue that both kinds of representations, master narrative or more historical accounts, are learned and developed. Thus, in part national identity is interiorized through master narratives, corresponding to the finding that these narratives were implemented in history education at the beginning of the twentieth century to construct national identities in the populace (Bertoni, 2001). This interiorization does not happen in a purely cognitive way. In practices of remembering in Argentina, the so-called patriotic rituals that were also implemented at the beginning of the 20th century (Bertoni, 2001), the nation or the national historical protagonist is

embodied. Patriotic rituals play an important role in many countries. In Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Uruguay at least four historical and patriotic commemorations take place in school every year. They are dramatizations of and discussions about the events, battles and national heroes related to the processes of independence of the country. In the United States these kinds of activities are performed on many historical and monumental sites (McCalman & Pickering, 2010), apart from those performed in schools.

Patriotic reenactments, usually heroic and celebratory, unite stories in a long narrative chain that links them by virtue of the role they play in the construction of the nation. These narratives adopt a teleological form, also in relation to each other; destiny is already contained in the origins, and knowledge of the “roots” of a nation is indispensable for knowing how to act in the future. The patriotic scenarios convey an important amount of historical contents that influence student’s understanding of the history contained in the formal curriculum and textbooks (Carretero, 2011, Chapter 4). Students consume and use national historical narratives that they learn from these kinds of events, in and out of the school. Given the results and fragments discussed above, it could even be said that patriotic ritual is more influential than history textbooks, because no contemporary Argentine high school history textbook states that on May 25th 1810 the Argentines became independent from Spain. Independence was declared on July 9th 1816. Patriotic rituals in Argentina contain the central historical events of national history, expressing as well as enacting the master narrative. Being in the metaphorical shoes of national historical protagonists - ‘the people becoming independent’ - is a very active way of remembering and identifying. Not only children but also their parents participate in these collective memories, such that the master narrative is converted into family memory (see Shore & Kauko, this volume). These rituals make a timeless connection between the supposed historical protagonists and the primary school children interpreting them. Repetition is part of the strength of ritual in collective remembering (Connerton, 1989). Here it strengthens the master narrative such that it becomes more and more dominant in the child’s representation of history. Patriotic rituals may play the same role in the common representation of history as the archives do in the historians view on the past. That is to say, patriotic rituals likely provide a truth-value to a romantic representation of the past, for the following reasons:

- a) the child is involved in these rituals at an age (4-6 years old) that does not yet allow critical thinking;
- b) the national master narrative is repeated every year, almost in the same way;
- c) no possible counter narrative or alternative account is offered;
- d) patriotic rituals in many countries are milestones of the school year, in terms of how the time is organized;
- e) they are supported not only by the school but by society in general.

In terms of the differences between collective memory and history discussed earlier, one wonders whether patriotic rituals are implemented by national school systems as educational contents related to history or rather to collective memory. They are considered to be historical because they are about the past, but they are probably more collective memory than history. In this respect, the words of Le Goff should be considered:

Memory is a conquest, it must seek and preserve that what allows it to construct itself from a perspective of truth. It must dispel false legends, black or golden, about such episodes of the past, collect the maximum amount of documents and confront contradictory memories, open up the archives and impede their destruction, know to look for the memory expelled to the taboos of history during certain periods in certain systems in literature or in art, and recognize the plurality of legitimate memories. (Le Goff, 1992, p. 15).

CONCLUSION

The implementation of the master narrative, in early history education and in ongoing celebrations, in our opinion can help explain why an invented nation, according to contemporary historiography (Hobsbawm & Ranger, 1983; Anderson, 1983), or a national identity that is itself historical (Chiaromonte, 1989; Berger, 2012; Smith, 2001) can become so psychologically real. We have emphasized that it should not be taken for granted that people organize their past in a national key. Apart from explaining these national memories from a traditional social psychological point of view in terms of ingroup-outgroup processes, their proper history needs to be taken into account. That is, national identity is of course a matter of social psychology, but it is also historical. We have aimed to build an interdisciplinary bridge between history and psychology, taking the historicity of the master narrative as a cultural tool into account. Looking at national history we see that the discipline is in fact quite young, and that the concept of nation and category of national identity started influencing the way the past was written in the 19th century. Since then the master narrative has influenced education and started to frame how the past is represented. This means that there are other possible ways of representing the past, related to other collective memories or to different written histories. The same way that there is no single collective memory, such as a national memory in narrative form, there is no single history. To some theoreticians, history is narrative and is the same as collective memory. But this is a somewhat shallow interpretation, given the wide spectrum of histories written from new perspectives (Burke, 2001) and the attempt to compare perspectives instead of vindicating just one of them.

In this chapter we have tried to distance ourselves from collective memory to see how it is centered in a generally nationalist perspective. We have seen that even in history education history is understood nationally, and that what is ultimately fostered might be more national memory than anything else. Students and citizens themselves are capable of critically reflecting on single versions of the past when other versions are introduced. Contextualizing the essentially national historical protagonist of the master narrative seems a crucial step towards diversifying collective memory. This way, we think, historiography has something important to contribute to collective memory: it can help introduce new perspective. To open up collective memory for alternative not nationally formatted accounts particular historiographical techniques, such as taking a distance from history and critically interrogating the concepts and narratives we take for granted, are elementary. Paradoxically, therefore, we need to question collective memory in order to expand it, beyond dominant national points of view.

DISCUSIÓN

En los primeros capítulos de esta Tesis Doctoral se ha considerado en detalle cómo la representación de un acontecimiento histórico nacional está mediada por la narrativa maestra; y cómo el pasado se entiende en términos de la nación y la identidad nacional por parte de los alumnos de secundaria. A continuación, se analizarán las características encontradas de la narrativa maestra, el cambio y la coherencia observada en las narraciones de los estudiantes, así como las relaciones entre el pasado y el presente nacional. Después, las elaboraciones teóricas de los demás capítulos se integrarán a la discusión sobre la tensión entre la comprensión de la Historia nacional y la construcción de la identidad nacional, en la que está involucrada la narrativa maestra. ¿Cómo puede un concepto de identidad, no esencial y dinámico, contribuir a una comprensión más histórica sobre la identidad nacional? ¿Cómo se relaciona esto con la idea de la construcción de la identidad y qué significa esto para la enseñanza de la Historia? ¿Cómo pueden tanto la historiografía y la memoria colectiva contribuir a la construcción del pasado nacional? y, en última instancia, ¿puede una narrativa sobre la Historia de la nación integrar la comprensión histórica y la construcción de identidades? Estas preguntas, serán objeto de reflexión a continuación.

REPRESENTANDO LA NARRATIVA MAESTRA

En general, se puede concluir que los estudiantes entrevistados en el contexto de esta investigación tienen una representación de los eventos del 25 de mayo 1810 en Buenos Aires en la cual predomina la narrativa maestra. Es decir que el estudio confirma los trabajos previos que presentaban a la narrativa como una poderosa herramienta cultural en la representación del pasado nacional (Barton, 2001; López, Carretero & Rodríguez-Moneo, 2014a; 2014b; Penuel & Wertsch, 2000; Wertsch, 2002). En el primer capítulo, se presenta un esquema analítico para estudiar la representación narrativa de los estudiantes. En términos de este esquema, se encontraron diferencias entre los alumnos de los grados 8 y 11.¹⁸ En el 89% por ciento de los casos el sujeto histórico de la narración que los estudiantes de 8° grado construyeron sobre el 25 de mayo 1810 fue homogéneo y los acontecimientos históricos se simplificaron de manera monocausal en torno a la búsqueda de la libertad o la independencia. Pero esto mismo sólo ocurrió en la mitad de las narraciones de los estudiantes de grado 11, lo que indica que a esta

¹⁸ En Argentina estos grados escolares corresponden al primer y el cuarto año de la secundaria, con alumnos de alrededor de 13 y 16 años respectivamente.

edad más estudiantes son conscientes de la diversidad de actores históricos y de la complejidad de los acontecimientos históricos.

Con respecto al concepto de nación, también se encontró un cambio, entre el 67% por ciento de los estudiantes de 8° grado y sólo el 25% por ciento de los estudiantes de 11° grado conciben a la nación de manera esencialista. Esto significa que los estudiantes en general poseen un conocimiento más elaborado de la nación como una construcción histórica y progresan aún más en el 11° grado. Esto podría deberse al aprendizaje sobre los procesos históricos del 25 de mayo 1810 que se da entre los grados 8 y 11. No obstante, la identificación, medida por el uso implícito del 'nosotros' en la construcción de la narrativa histórica, continúa siendo constante a través de los años escolares y se encuentra en la mayoría de los estudiantes entrevistados. Al entrar en un análisis más detallado, la esencia de la nación parece estar, para los estudiantes, en la búsqueda de libertad y del sujeto histórico homogéneo. La construcción de la nación es entendida de un modo teleológico, incluso en el 11° grado. Por un lado, las representaciones fueron en su mayoría caracterizadas por la existencia de argentinos o por un pueblo unido construyendo una nación o peleando para ser libres. Por otro lado, el pasado y el presente fueron conectados teleológicamente en la apropiación de la narrativa maestra. Para varios estudiantes, sobre todo en el grado 11, está claro que la nación no ha existido siempre, pero como se ilustra con más detalle en el capítulo 2, ellos sin embargo establecen una identificación entre las personas en 1810 y las de ahora a través de la búsqueda de la independencia o la solidaridad nacional. Esta representación corresponde muy bien a las narrativas maestras en el contexto postcolonial en general, tal como en el 'credo americano' de libertad e igualdad y sus temas narrativos correspondientes (Alridge, 2006; VanSledright, 2008). En este aspecto teleológico, las similitudes entre el uso político del pasado y la apropiación del *mito de origen* por parte de la presidente argentina Cristina Kirchner y del presidente estadounidense Obama son claras, como se ha visto en el capítulo 2.

La manera en la que la presidente Kirchner se apropió de la narrativa maestra es muy similar a la que los adolescentes argentinos de 16 años representan el 25 de mayo 1810 e indica que la explicación teleológica, la identificación histórica y la idealización son construcciones de la relación entre el pasado y el presente a través de los diferentes niveles de apropiación de la narrativa maestra. La *identificación* del pasado y el presente considera a la identidad nacional como una categoría natural y trascendental. La *idealización* toma al pasado nacional como un ejemplo moral, heroico o patriótico. La *interpretación teleológica* del pasado toma al resultado de un proceso histórico como objetivo inherente y predeterminado del mismo proceso. En términos de estas tres construcciones, la construcción de la identidad nacional es inherente a las narrativas maestras apropiadas. Este tipo de relaciones entre el pasado y el presente se

consideran en oposición a la comprensión histórica, de manera implícita en el capítulo 2 y de modo explícito en el capítulo 1. El uso predominante del 'nosotros' en la representación de los eventos de hace más de 200 años, se considera una confusión del pasado y del presente en oposición al desarrollo del pensamiento histórico. La identificación en este sentido es considerada como una falta de comprensión de que el pasado es un país extranjero (Lowenthal, 1985). De manera más general, las características de la narrativa maestra en el capítulo 1 se oponen claramente a una comprensión históricamente contextualizada de lo que ocurrió el 25 de Mayo de 1810. Pero, en lugar de interpretar los resultados en términos de los dos objetivos opuestos de enseñanza de la Historia podríamos preguntar, ¿existe una tensión al nivel de la representación narrativa misma de los estudiantes?

Las narraciones obtenidas en el trabajo empírico de esta Tesis fueron en general bastante coherentes. Es decir, el 76% por ciento de todas las narraciones estuvieron predominantemente caracterizadas por las dimensiones de las narrativas maestras o por elementos de un abordaje más disciplinario. En el grado 8, el 83% por ciento demostró al menos tres de las cuatro características de las narrativas maestras. En el grado 11, el 40% por ciento de las narraciones contenía una mayoría de elementos disciplinarios. Sin embargo, en el 35% por ciento de las representaciones de los estudiantes de 11° grado, las características de la narrativa maestra y los elementos disciplinarios se mostraban en igual cantidad. Como se ha visto, las tensiones dentro de las narraciones surgieron de un concepto construido de nación, por un lado, y una representación homogénea del sujeto histórico, por otro. No sólo se hace evidente en el fragmento de Germán, de 13 años, en el primer capítulo, sino también en el fragmento de Luisa, de 16 años, en el quinto capítulo. Esto parece indicar, además, que la comprensión histórica y la comprensión romántica de nación se enfrentan de manera tensionada en la representación de los estudiantes acerca de la Historia nacional (ver también Carretero & Kriger, 2011). En el caso de Germán esta tensión es resuelta por una identidad nacional común y por un propósito que une al pasado y el presente. Es decir, prevalece una comprensión romántica. En el caso de Luisa, una concepción constructivista de la nación se ve reforzada por la conciencia de la diversidad social y étnica de los actores en el pasado. Este sujeto histórico y heterogéneo hace que los acontecimientos históricos simplificados no tienen sentido. Ella dice "...pero planteándolo así te das cuenta que la mayor población era española y era por eso, por ahí querían independizarse ellos mismos de España." Su comprensión más disciplinaria de los acontecimientos parece estar en camino.

En estos casos, la tensión entre los diferentes objetivos de la enseñanza de la Historia se refleja al nivel individual de representación en la tensión entre la narrativa maestra y los elementos disciplinarios. En este sentido se puede afirmar que una representación en la línea de la

narrativa maestra complica el desarrollo de una comprensión disciplinaria. Más bien, estos hallazgos indican que un concepto construido de nación tiene que ir acompañado por cambios en el mito de origen nacional, con el fin de desarrollar una comprensión más disciplinaria. Particularmente el hecho de concebir al sujeto histórico, como homogéneo o en términos de una identidad nacional, parece esencial para una representación del estilo narrativa maestra. En cuanto los actores históricos son contextualizados, pluralizados o desnacionalizados, un relato más complejo sobre los eventos que el de la narrativa maestra, se hace viable. Esto se corresponde con el trabajo empírico y teórico previo que indica que el sujeto histórico nacional es una dimensión central de la narrativa maestra y que una comprensión disciplinaria involucra tanto un cambio conceptual como la modificación de la representación narrativa de la nación (Carretero, Castorina & Levinas, 2013; Castorina et al., 2015; López, Carretero & Rodríguez-Moneo, 2014a, 2014b).

En los dos últimos estudios citados de carácter empírico, se encontró que la representación del pasado nacional a través de la narrativa maestra persiste en la edad adulta en una población de estudiantes españoles, y que dicha representación incluye un concepto esencialista de nación. Así, por un lado tenemos a los estudiantes de secundaria argentinos, capaces de desarrollar un concepto de nación constructivista pero manteniendo las explicaciones teleológicas del pasado. Por el otro lado, los estudiantes españoles mantienen un claro concepto esencialista de nación. ¿Qué nos dice esto sobre el desarrollo y el cambio de las representaciones, como la narrativa maestra? ¿Se fortalece la representación romántica del pasado una vez que el estudiante no está más expuesto a explicaciones históricas complejas, típicas de las clases de historia de la secundaria? Para poder entender mejor el proceso de cambio o la perseverancia de la narrativa maestra en la representación de alumnos y estudiantes, deberán realizarse estudios transversales y longitudinales adicionales. Un examen detallado de la representación de la Historia nacional, en términos del esquema analítico presentado en el capítulo 1, o la construcción de la relación entre el pasado y el presente como se sugiere en el capítulo 2, sin duda contribuiría. También permitiría una comparación más extensa entre los diferentes contextos nacionales, para saber, por ejemplo, si la representación del *mito de origen* en España es más esencialista frente a una narrativa más teleológica en Argentina o en Estados Unidos. Las diferencias históricas entre el nacionalismo sudamericano y nacionalismo europeo descritas por Anderson (1991) podrían reflejarse en las representaciones de los alumnos, y esto contribuiría a la idea de que existe un formateo de la representación del pasado por parte de la narrativa maestra. Es decir, el proceso psicológico es entonces claramente incrustado en un contexto socio-histórico y la gente utiliza las herramientas narrativas a su disposición para la representación del pasado. Estas herramientas existen en un contexto específico; no obstante, pueden tener elementos narrativos comunes que permitan su posterior análisis y comparación.

La comparación de las narrativas maestras, facilitada por la observación de sus elementos específicos, también puede ser útil en un sentido educativo, permitiendo a los estudiantes a ver las diferentes pero similares construcciones del pasado, en todo el mundo. Esto se verá elaborado más adelante en términos de posibles implicaciones educativas.

Hasta el momento, se puede concluir, sobre la base de los datos empíricos y los análisis presentados en esta Tesis, que la narrativa maestra que hemos podido encontrar en los estudiantes de diferentes edades se relaciona positivamente con el objetivo educativo de la construcción de la identidad nacional y negativamente con la comprensión histórica disciplinaria del acontecimiento histórico. Sin embargo, la 'construcción de la identidad nacional' en este sentido significa que la narrativa maestra como tal construye una similitud entre el pasado y el presente nacional o conecta el pasado y el presente teleológicamente y que así se representa de forma individual. De hecho, el gran relato nacional está dirigido a la construcción de la identidad nacional, como cualquier herramienta cultural que tiene un objetivo específico. Sin embargo, tener una representación narrativa maestra no significa automáticamente que el estudiante se identifica con la nación, su historia o protagonista. Es decir, el objetivo de la construcción de la identidad nacional en términos de generar compromiso nacional en el estudiante, no es necesariamente alcanzado. Esto tiene que ver con la tensión irreductible entre el agente y la herramienta cultural. Dos observaciones en los primeros capítulos invitan a reflexionar sobre este asunto. En primer lugar, la identificación como característica de la narrativa maestra no se relaciona de manera totalmente uniforme con las otras características. Probablemente en función de la coherencia narrativa, el sujeto histórico homogéneo, los eventos simplificados y el concepto esencialista de nación están relacionados de manera significativa pero la identificación que se mide por el uso del 'nosotros' en las narraciones de los estudiantes no lo está. Resulta notable que el 44% por ciento de los estudiantes de 8° grado no utilizó 'nosotros' pero demostró una representación narrativa maestra en todas las otras características. Por otro lado, el 20% por ciento de los estudiantes de 11° grado hizo uso del 'nosotros', pero demostró una comprensión más histórica sobre los demás elementos narrativos. La coexistencia de la identificación con un relato más disciplinario puede interpretarse en función de los dos objetivos de la enseñanza de la Historia, que influyen simultáneamente en las representaciones de los alumnos, sobre todo en el grado 11, cuando han recibido más educación en Historia. Sin embargo, ¿cómo debería interpretarse la falta de identificación junto a los tres otros aspectos indicando una narrativa maestra en el grado 8?, ¿Qué sienten los estudiantes cuando se están apropiando de una narrativa maestra o hablan de 'nosotros', en un pasado de hace 203 años?, ¿Su discurso en términos de 'nosotros' sugiere un nacionalismo banal, en la forma en que Billig (1995) lo indicó?, ¿Estos estudiantes simplemente hablan en términos de una etiqueta superficial de nacionalidad o sienten que pertenecen a un grupo nacional y, por lo tanto,

hablan en voz colectiva? En el sentido sociocultural, la diferencia entre el dominio cognitivo de la narrativa maestra y apropiársela es esclarecedora.

Como se vio en la introducción, Wertsch (1998; 2002) hacía una distinción entre dos niveles de apropiación. Define el dominio de una narrativa histórica como una operación cognitiva limitada, con poco que decir acerca de la implicación emocional del sujeto. El uso de ‘nosotros’, entonces, significa simplemente repetir la historia tal como los estudiantes la oyeron, como si estuvieran hablando con la voz de otra persona. La apropiación completa significa que la voz individual del narrador y la voz colectiva de la narrativa coinciden. La narrativa debe ser considerada propia y tener un sentido personal con el fin de servir como un recurso para el anclaje o la construcción de la propia identidad (Wertsch, 2002). La apropiación puede implicar una transformación de la narrativa, siempre que los objetivos de la narrativa estén en sintonía con el objetivo del agente en el uso de la herramienta cultural (Wertsch, 1998). Es probable que el abordaje metodológico del estudio empírico en el capítulo 1, provoque el dominio cognitivo en lugar de apropiación emocional. El estudio fue dirigido a la representación de los estudiantes. Los contenidos de la entrevista fueron relacionados con la Historia escolar y las entrevistas se llevaron a cabo en la escuela de los participantes. De hecho, la apropiación depende del contexto en el que la narración se invoca (Wertsch, 1998). En el segundo capítulo esta diferencia fue marcada por el discurso presidencial en oposición a las representaciones de los alumnos. El presidente, en la situación de la conmemoración colectiva, utiliza activamente la narrativa maestra y le da significado político. Los estudiantes a los cuales se pregunta sobre el evento histórico, no necesitan utilizar la herramienta para sus propios fines. Ellos pueden demostrar un distanciado dominio de la narrativa, como se vio en muchos de los estudiantes de 8° grado, o pueden usar ‘nosotros’ como una etiqueta de nacionalidad superficial en lugar de comprometerse activamente con esta voz colectiva.

La segunda observación respecto a la identificación, es que al observar cómo se construye la relación entre el pasado y el presente, parece que habría dos maneras de llevarla a cabo. Una identificación *entre* el pasado y el presente en términos de una identidad nacional, y una identificación *con* la narrativa de la nación o con su protagonista nacional. A pesar de que esta última es una identificación más explícita que la identificación implícita en términos del uso de ‘nosotros’, esto indica que el estudiante se identifica activamente con el protagonista de la narrativa nacional. La identificación *entre* el pasado y el presente es inherente a la narrativa maestra y puede estar teóricamente relacionada con el dominio de la herramienta cultural. La identificación *con* la narrativa maestra, su protagonista o los eventos, tiene que ver con apropiarse de la narrativa. En este sentido, las similitudes entre el discurso presidencial y las representaciones de los estudiantes son sorprendentes y una apropiación total de la narrativa se

ve en algunas de las entrevistas con los estudiantes del 11° grado, tal y como se presentaron en el segundo capítulo. Por ejemplo Mariano, de 16 años, se apropia de la narrativa maestra relacionándola con la causa de la recuperación de las Islas Malvinas / Falklands. Para él, esa lucha está tan viva hoy como lo estuvo la lucha por la independencia en 1810. Ambos son ejemplos de lucha nacional. Esta lucha nacional es lo que el sujeto histórico de 1810 y el sujeto nacional actual tienen en común. Históricamente hablando, hay grandes diferencias entre los involucrados del año 1810 y los del conflicto de 1982 con Gran Bretaña, entre lo que querían, y a quienes representaban, pero esa no es la consideración de Mariano.

La apropiación completa es más evidente en el caso de Violeta, de 16 años. A través de la elaboración de una relación teleológica entre pasado, presente y futuro, se involucra activamente en la narrativa y se identifica con los protagonistas del 25 de mayo. El *telos* de libertad e igualdad la une con los *próceres* o padres fundadores. Como fue observado en el capítulo 4, la identidad tiene un fuerte componente teleológico que hasta ahora ha sido poco estudiado en la psicología. La identidad nacional ha sido considerada parte de una estrategia política en su estudio histórico. A nivel psicológico, el aspecto teleológico de la identidad nacional invita a una mayor consideración. Reconceptualizar la identidad como identificación y, por tanto, como una actividad más que como una esencia (ver capítulo 3), el componente teleológico de identificación puede ser observado en el relato de Violeta. La identificación *con* la narrativa parece estar relacionada con compartir las metas con los protagonistas de la narrativa maestra. Este tipo de identificación dirigida hacia el futuro es similar a la identificación cívica (Carretero, Haste & Bermudez, en prensa; Haste & Hogan, 2012; Barton & Levstik, 2004) y necesita ser estudiada con más profundidad en relación a la comprensión histórica. Se precisa de investigación adicional para averiguar si en representaciones como la de Violeta los elementos disciplinarios y los elementos de la narrativa maestra entran en conflicto o coexisten.

Es cierto que para Violeta el pasado nacional no es un país extranjero. Según su relato, el pasado hizo su existencia posible y la proyecta hacia el futuro. Por lo tanto, desde el punto de vista de la comprensión histórica como objetivo de la enseñanza de la Historia, ella no parece capaz de comprender al pasado en sus propios términos. En términos de los patrones narrativos analizados en el capítulo 1, su relato cae en la categoría intermedia entre narrativa maestra y elementos disciplinarios. De la misma manera que Germán de 13 años, Violeta une un concepto constructivista de nación con un sujeto histórico homogéneo a través de una explicación teleológica. Sin embargo, ofrece además explicaciones sociopolíticas y económicas más complejas sobre lo que ocurrió el 25 de mayo 1810 y no expresa ninguna duda sobre las posibles incompatibilidades entre su relato teleológico y otros factores históricos más complejos. En este sentido, una vez más vemos que el sujeto histórico homogéneo es una dimensión fundamental

de la narrativa maestra que, junto con la explicación teleológica, sostiene esta representación del pasado nacional. Su interés en el pasado también podría acercar Violeta a una comprensión más disciplinaria, en el sentido de que la identificación puede ser un beneficio (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Hammack, 2010; Goldberg, 2013). Sin embargo, lo que se ha observado es que en el caso de Violeta, la identificación nacional activa y apropiación de la narrativa maestra coexisten con algunas dimensiones disciplinarias. Ambos objetivos de la enseñanza de la Historia son logrados hasta cierto punto, pero la narrativa maestra prevalece. La narrativa maestra, como tal, y la relación simplificada entre pasado y presente que involucra, está negativamente relacionada con la comprensión disciplinar de la Historia. Sin embargo, para ver si la narrativa maestra es constitutiva para la identificación nacional, en el sentido de implicarse personalmente en lugar de la identificación histórica entre pasado y el presente nacional, hay que seguir investigando. Por ejemplo, se puede estudiar la apropiación completa y, a partir de ahí, la identificación personal, en un contexto que invite al estudiante a utilizar activamente la narrativa maestra. Con respecto a la apropiación de y la identificación con la narrativa, el componente teleológico es particularmente interesante para ver en más detalle (véase también Carretero & Solcoff, 2012). ¿Es la representación individual de la nación un campo de batalla entre la proyección hacia el futuro y el conocimiento del pasado? ¿O pueden estas representaciones seguir coexistiendo relativamente en paz? Más investigación podrá decirlo.

LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE LA IDENTIDAD NACIONAL

Tal como fue ilustrado en la discusión previa sobre la apropiación de la narrativa maestra, la idea de 'construcción de la identidad nacional' se encuentra con algunas reservas psicológicas. Esta idea describe un proceso histórico que ha sido estudiado por Hobsbawm (1992) y Smith (1991) y, describe un proceso sociopolítico que los planes de estudio y los libros de texto de Historia tuvieron como objetivo (Foster & Crawford, 2006; Grever & Stuurman, 2007). Además, esta idea corresponde a la función de las narrativas maestras y de la memoria colectiva, y se ha encontrado que éstas enmarcan la representación del pasado nacional. Sin embargo, lo que es histórica, social o 'narrativamente' construido no tiene por qué ser (re)construido de forma individual. En términos socioculturales, el agente puede resistirse o rechazar la herramienta cultural y participar activamente en el proceso de representación. Quizás debería formularse de manera diferente: apuntar a que las personas se identifiquen con la nación no quiere decir que, en última instancia, un ciudadano se identifica con la nación. Tal como será argumentado, en línea con el capítulo 3, abordar la identidad nacional como si fuese una entidad resulta problemático. Acercarse a la identificación nacional como si fuese un proceso no solo podría facilitar la discusión y la investigación interdisciplinaria, sino que además, considerar la

identidad nacional como una categoría histórica dinámica, podría contribuir a una mayor comprensión histórica entre investigadores, educadores y estudiantes.

A pesar de que la idea de la construcción se comparte a través de las disciplinas, el concepto de identidad está rodeado de debates interdisciplinarios, que incluso a veces no son de todo claros (Alcoff & Mendieta, 2003; Matusov & Smith, 2012; Rosa & Blanco, 2007). Muchas veces la identidad se entiende de manera diferente según cada enfoque disciplinario. Desde la psicología evolutiva, la construcción de identidad nacional se ha aproximado en términos de la construcción de conocimiento sobre la identidad nacional y como el desarrollo de una parte de la identidad personal, que sin embargo ha sido poco investigado (Del Barrio et al., 2013). El desarrollo de la identidad como tal fue estudiado por Erikson (1968), pero su noción esencialista de identidad ha sido criticado (Matusov & Smith, 2012). Capítulo 3 extiende sobre esa discusión, la cual se retomará aquí en términos de la identidad nacional. Para un psicólogo, incluso cognitivo constructivista, suena extraña la idea que las identidades son construidas en las personas, porque se supone que una persona es activa en la construcción de sus identidades, además de poseer una identidad previamente. En el capítulo 4, pudo verse cómo los ex militantes sandinistas tienen su propia manera de construir y representar sus identidades, en oposición a los relatos oficiales y de los medios de comunicación también porque, para ellos, lo que pasó en 1979 es personal. En este caso, la construcción de la identidad es un proceso narrativo individual, incrustado en un determinado contexto social. Psicológicamente, se podría concebir la identidad como una conciencia reflexiva acerca de uno mismo o de un relato construido sobre uno mismo, en relación con la memoria individual autobiográfica (Ricoeur, 1992; Rochat, 2009; Wertsch, 2002). Cuando la interpretación del sí mismo está mediada por narraciones, se refiere a identidad narrativa (Rosa & Blanco, 2007). Mucho debate ha acompañado a la noción psicológica de identidad. Como se pudo ver también en capítulo 3, está frecuentemente vinculada a la individualidad ('self'). Las ideas o representaciones sobre uno mismo se pueden construir, pero también hay alguien haciendo la narración. En este sentido, hay una distinción teórica entre una perspectiva en primera persona, un 'yo' ('I') subjetivo, y una perspectiva en tercera persona, la representación de uno mismo, por ejemplo a través de una narrativa autobiográfica, y la presentación de esta identidad personal a los demás: este soy 'yo' ('me') (Mead, 1934; véase también Rosa & Blanco, 2007). La compleja relación entre el 'mi' mismo, la narrativa y la identidad constituye un campo interdisciplinario en sí, en el que el 'yo' se vuelve cada vez más relacional, la narración más práctica y las identidades más plurales (Bamberg, 2009; Bamberg, DeFina & Schiffrin, 2007). Sin embargo, un 'yo' subjetivo y narrador no se construye de la misma manera en la que se construyen las narrativas acerca de uno mismo y de los demás. La construcción social de la identidad de una persona tiene entonces un límite cuando se considera que la persona es un organismo que experimenta y narra activamente. En

otras palabras, la identidad psicológica no puede ser meramente explicada en términos sociales, ya que está muy entrelazada con una auto-conciencia básica. Por otra parte, los aspectos sociales e históricos de la identidad tampoco pueden ser simplemente explicados en términos de procesos psicológicos fundamentales.

Las identidades sociales fueron predominantemente abordadas en la psicología como una cuestión de auto-categorización (ver la obra de referencia por Turner et al., 1987). Frente a (miembros de) otro grupo social, la propia identidad social se vuelve saliente. Por lo tanto, la identidad nacional es un tipo de identidad social y se refiere a un sentido de pertenencia a un grupo nacional y a la identificación con los connacionales. Esto sucede en oposición a otro grupo nacional. En este orden de ideas, Hogan (2009) considera que el nacionalismo es "cualquier forma de identificación de grupo para un grupo definido en parte por referencia a una zona geográfica junto con alguna forma de gobierno soberano sobre esa área" (p. 4; traducción propia). El nacionalismo es entonces considerado como un proceso psicológico social común, que va mucho más atrás en el tiempo que los primeros movimientos nacionalistas del Siglo XIX. Ahora bien, la identificación con el endo-grupo nacional, como tal, puede ser muy común, pero esto no quiere decir que debe ser naturalizada en lugar de ser estudiada en más detalle. Billig (1995) y Reicher y Hopkins (2001) argumentan que el nacionalismo banal y las prácticas nacionales discursivas políticas deberían ser investigados por la psicología social, en lugar de darlos por sentado. Sobre todo porque la identificación en términos de nación no es un proceso natural: la nación y su identidad se han construido históricamente y esta identificación fue culturalmente avalada hace muy poco tiempo en la historia humana. Además, una auto-categorización real en términos de una identidad nacional, o una construcción psicológica real de la identidad nacional de uno mismo o, incluso elegir la propia nacionalidad es prácticamente imposible. La gente simplemente tiene una identidad nacional, porque se les asigna al nacer, y es considerada como su *explanans* en lugar de un *explanandum*. A menudo se toma a la identidad nacional como una variable independiente en la psicología social y transcultural (por ejemplo, Liu et al., 2012). Por lo tanto una categoría que es sociohistóricamente construida determina ciertos procesos psicológicos o se naturaliza en estos mismos procesos. No resulta sorprendente que esto sea así en tanto que estos procesos involucren el uso de un idioma específico o el compartir ciertos hábitos, pero ni el lenguaje ni los hábitos están necesariamente limitados por las fronteras nacionales ni son constantes en el tiempo. Muchos científicos sociales están de acuerdo en que es muy difícil definir a la nación (Anderson, 1991; Seton-Watson, 1977; Smith, 1991), y que se debe considerar como una construcción social en vez de una esencia natural. En ese sentido, el capítulo 2 representa un argumento en contra de dar por sentada esta construcción sociohistórica en la investigación psicológica. Una narrativa maestra no es una construcción psicológica obvia del pasado nacional, aunque el pensamiento narrativo sea una

manera fundamentalmente humana de organizar y representar el mundo (Bruner, 1990). Más bien, estos procesos constructivos se enmarcan en formatos compartidos colectivamente. De acuerdo con el capítulo 3, es necesario tener en cuenta que no sólo la nación es efímera e histórica, sino que la identidad nacional es efímera e histórica también. Tomar una identidad nacional como una esencia personal es tan discutible como la esencia atemporal de nación. De la misma manera en que los conceptos históricos como 'nación' surgen y cambian a lo largo de la historia (Koselleck, 1975; 1996), las nociones psicológicas tales como la 'identidad' tienen una historia dinámica (Hacking, 1986; 1995), porque son socialmente practicadas e internalizadas. Que la nación no se entienda históricamente o dinámicamente tiene mucho que ver con abordar la identidad como si fuese una entidad sustancial.

La confusión puede evitarse en gran parte mediante la consideración de la identidad como un proceso en lugar de una entidad (Valsiner, 2012; Rosa & Blanco, 2007). Lo relevante para una investigación más detallada sobre el aprendizaje y la representación de la Historia, es el proceso de identificación o la acción de identificar. En este sentido, 'la construcción de la identidad nacional' significa conseguir que la gente se identifique con la nación, un grupo socio político atemporal, un territorio, una lengua, sea cual fuera; la identificación nacional sucede de muchas maneras diferentes. Cuando la gente construye su identidad nacional, lo cual suena extraño dado que nunca eligieron una activamente, significa que de algún modo, según los términos operativos de esta Tesis Doctoral, se están apropiando de la narrativa de la nación. Ciertamente, una narrativa colectiva no es tan personal y tampoco se relaciona con el recuerdo de las propias experiencias como una narrativa autobiográfica. Hay que aprenderla, es decir, dominarla o apropiarla. En ese sentido, puede haber una identificación con la nación al compartir un objetivo con el protagonista de una narrativa histórica, por ejemplo. El estudio de las prácticas de identidad nacional a través de la construcción de la narrativa evita el problema de convertir la identidad en una entidad, y también resuelve la tensión interdisciplinaria entre el constructivismo social e individual a través de un abordaje sociocultural. Pero lo que encontramos en estos mismos estudios es que la identidad nacional se convierte estructuralmente en una entidad. Los estudiantes comprenden el pasado de una manera homogeneizada y predeterminada a través de narrativas maestras e identidades nacionales que se sustentan mutuamente. Dada la preocupación en las ciencias sociales por la categorización social, no se puede sostener que el origen de este fenómeno se encuentra en la propia actividad de los estudiantes. En ese sentido, la concepción histórica y dinámica de la identidad nacional sugerida también en el capítulo 3 es, en primer lugar, una reflexión sobre cómo se usa la 'identidad' en las ciencias humanas y sociales. Sin embargo, su discusión es particularmente relevante en el ámbito de la enseñanza y el aprendizaje de la Historia. A continuación se explica

por qué en la enseñanza de la Historia una concepción histórica y dinámica de la identidad nacional podría establecer una manera diferente de aproximar la ‘construcción de identidades’.

El proceso de categorización social en términos de identidades nacionales sucede desde que las naciones y sus identidades correspondientes fueron inventadas. En este sentido, la identidad nacional no es una entidad sino una categoría a la que pertenecen algunas personas y no otras. Según el filósofo Ian Hacking (1986; 2000), este tipo de categoría humana (‘human kind’) tiene una ‘ontología’ histórica: la identidad nacional llegó a existir históricamente. Esto no sólo otorga a las personas una nueva herramienta para etiquetar el mundo que les rodea, sino que también modifica las prácticas sociales; también puede verse en la exitosa implementación de la mitología programática de la nación (Hobsbawm, 1992). En otras palabras, las categorías humanas presentes en las ciencias sociales se caracterizan por ‘efectos bucle’ (Hacking, 1995). Es decir, cuando los seres humanos son clasificados, reaccionan a su categorización y en general aceptan la categoría y actúan a modo de confirmar su clasificación.

Las formas de acción que ellos eligen y sus formas de ser, de ninguna manera son independientes de las descripciones disponibles bajo las cuales pueden actuar. Del mismo modo, nos experimentamos a nosotros mismos en el mundo como personas de diversos tipos. [...] Este conocimiento puede ser personal pero, más comúnmente, es un conocimiento compartido y desarrollado dentro de un grupo de personas, incrustado en las prácticas y en las instituciones a las que se asignan las personas en virtud de la forma en la que estén clasificados. (Hacking, 1999, p. 103-104; traducción propia)

Los seres humanos también pueden resistirse a ser categorizados, de la misma manera que pueden resistirse a apropiarse de la herramienta cultural o la narrativa maestra. Sin embargo, el rechazo individual no impedirá que la identidad nacional tenga efectos importantes sobre la vida de las personas, ya que la categorización está más allá de una decisión personal y a esta altura está bien encajada en las prácticas sociales. Por supuesto que los protagonistas de los acontecimientos históricos pre-nacionales ya no pueden reaccionar ante su categorización, pero a medida que fueron convertidos en héroes ‘nacionales’, la categoría nacional se volvió aún más atractiva.

La identidad nacional resultó ser una categoría social de enorme éxito y fue naturalizada o banalizada (Billig, 1995; Reicher & Hopkins, 2001). Desde muy temprano los niños están expuestos a la categorización y son considerados nacionales. Aquí, al igual que en el desarrollo histórico de la identidad nacional, las narrativas maestras juegan un papel importante. Las narrativas maestras constituyen la identidad nacional y dan una legitimidad histórica a la identidad nacional (Smith, 1991). En simultáneo, presentan una categoría y le cuentan a las

personas que pertenecen a esa categoría. Las narrativas no sólo describen, sino que también adscriben y prescriben la identidad nacional. Esto no sucede necesariamente al dirigirse explícitamente a los miembros de un grupo nacional, sino de manera más implícita mediante la presentación de una historia destinada a los miembros de un grupo nacional. La persona que escucha la historia, al leerla, al observarla siendo representada de manera ritual o al participar en ese ritual, se va clasificando progresivamente, al mismo tiempo que es invitada a identificarse con la historia. En el estudio de las realidades híbridas del mundo, como los procesos de migración y de cruce cultural o étnico, se puede ver claramente que estas clasificaciones son problemáticas (p.ej. Bowker & Star, 2002; Alcoff & Mendieta, 2003). En estos contextos, sería muy interesante estudiar los procesos de aceptación o resistencia a la categorización y a la apropiación de la narrativa maestra.

Como se ha visto en los primeros capítulos, el concepto socialmente construido de nación es fácilmente aceptado por los estudiantes de la escuela secundaria argentina, pero al mismo tiempo la identidad nacional es 'esencializada' o naturalizada en un sujeto histórico homogéneo o en una explicación teleológica de los acontecimientos históricos. Esto tiene que ver con la omnipresencia de la narrativa maestra y con la identidad nacional que se toma como una entidad o esencia natural. Sin embargo, la narrativa maestra en sí, y la categoría de identidad nacional que la sustenta, son construcciones históricas, y hay una necesidad de reconocer esto con el fin de desarrollar una comprensión histórica de la nación. Considerando el punto de vista de Hacking, entender la identidad nacional históricamente sería explicarla contextualmente, investigar cómo surgió la categoría en un momento en el tiempo y como fue practicada y modificada desde entonces. Al mismo tiempo, se trata de reflexionar sobre una categoría que se volvió real. La identidad nacional se practica a través de la narrativa, el ritual, el fútbol, el turismo e incluso en el debate y en la investigación científico social, si es que los científicos insisten en nombrar o utilizar estas categorías. Pero cuando la identidad nacional es abordada como una clase humana, es decir una categorización socio-histórica de los seres humanos, se vuelve fluida. Dado que las personas constituyen esta categoría, pueden transformarla o resistirse a ella. Estos son lo que Hacking denominó 'efectos bucle de las clases humanas' (1995). Del mismo modo, las narrativas maestras que las personas se han apropiado pueden transformarse de manera significativa. En este orden de ideas, la identidad nacional y la narrativa maestra pueden ser cuestionadas y transformadas por los estudiantes. Por ejemplo, planteándose preguntas como las siguientes: ¿Qué queremos decir cuando hablamos de 'nosotros'?, ¿a quién nos referimos?, ¿qué tenemos y qué no tenemos en común?, ¿a dónde es que queremos ir realmente?, ¿todos nosotros? En este sentido, los alumnos pueden reflexionar acerca de la instrumentalidad de la narrativa y la categoría de identidad y comparar los objetivos inherentes de estos instrumentos de representación con sus propios objetivos. Entonces, ciertas

ideas de la filosofía de la historia (Koselleck, 1996), la filosofía de la ciencia (Hacking, 1995), y la psicología sociocultural (Wertsch, 1998) podrían ser muy útiles para la enseñanza de la Historia. Una categoría de identidad que es dinámica y no esencial, así como el concepto constructivista de nación podrían contribuir a una comprensión más histórica del pasado nacional. Esto no significa necesariamente dejar de lado a las categorías o narrativas históricas. Significa reflexionar sobre ellas, sus características y mecanismos, y darlas direcciones nuevas o plurales. Investigar con los estudiantes acerca del origen de la identidad nacional, lo que ha significado a través de los años e invitarlos a transformar la categoría a la que ahora pertenecen, podría ser una manera de superar un enfoque excluyente en la comprensión histórica o la identificación nacional, como objetivos legítimos de la enseñanza de la Historia nacional.

¿UN FUTURO PARA LA ENSEÑANZA DE LA HISTORIA?

Dada la posición extremadamente difícil de la enseñanza de la Historia en medio de la controversia política y social, el desarrollo de las implicaciones de una investigación psicológicamente orientada y conducida fuera del aula, resulta un esfuerzo modesto. Ciertamente, el modo en que los estudiantes aprenden no es automáticamente relevante respecto de la forma en que se debería enseñarles. El enfoque sociocultural podría hacer sugerencias específicas acerca de las herramientas que los profesores podrían proporcionar, porque se centra en las herramientas que utilizan los estudiantes. En la línea de esta Tesis, se refiere a las herramientas para la representación de la Historia. Como se dijo antes, no es necesario dejar de lado a las herramientas conceptuales, categóricas y narrativas nacionales. El análisis, la reflexión o la comparación en términos de las características de la narrativa maestra (¿Quiénes fueron los protagonistas?, ¿cuáles fueron los acontecimientos históricos?, ¿qué entendemos por 'nosotros'?, y otras preguntas similares) también podrían contribuir.

Las posibles implicaciones educativas, basadas en lo que se ha encontrado y considerado en ésta Tesis, giran alrededor de la nación como concepto, la identidad nacional como una categoría y la narrativa histórica nacional. El reconocimiento de la evolución histórica y el cambio, ya sea del concepto nación o de la categoría de la identidad nacional, ha sido un hilo conductor. El estudio en el primer capítulo sugiere que no sería muy difícil adquirir un concepto constructivista de nación, pero cuando una esencia nacional se mantiene a través de una identidad históricamente compartida o una explicación teleológica facilitada por la narrativa maestra, necesita de una reflexión adicional. La narrativa maestra y la categoría de identidad nacional pueden ser convertidas en los mismos objetos de investigación histórica. Pueden ser comparadas con otras narrativas maestras y la identidad nacional puede ser abordada como una 'clase humana' dinámica, pero real. El significado de la identidad nacional hoy en día, dada la diversidad de

valores y objetivos en el aula, podría ser útil en la reflexión sobre la supuesta homogeneidad del sujeto de la narrativa nacional y dar lugar a la diversidad de intereses entre los actores históricos. En la enseñanza de la Historia ha habido cada vez más sugerencias para navegar entre un enfoque interesado y la agudeza disciplinaria (Carretero & Kriger, 2010; Grever, de Bruijn & van Boxtel, 2012; Seixas, 2004). Al reflexionar sobre la identidad nacional y la narrativa que la sustenta, los estudiantes podrían aprender con más facilidad que éstas son herramientas de representación que implican ciertas estrategias políticas y que pueden ser consideradas desde una conciencia histórica que tenga en cuenta las habilidades del pensamiento (Seixas, 2004; Wertsch, 2002; Wineburg, 2001). También los estudiantes podrían inclinarse más a participar cívicamente en una construcción continua y heterogénea de la sociedad, que los representa mucho mejor que la figura de un hombre blanco en traje militar del Siglo XIX montado en un caballo rampante.

Si se toma a la identidad nacional como una esencia homogénea y estática, surgirán problemas en la comprensión de la historia y muy probablemente también en la educación cívica, porque esta esencia no puede dar cuenta de la pluralidad y los cambios sociales, políticos y culturales actuales. La formación de pensadores críticos, que sea capaces de contextualizar, ir más allá de su propia perspectiva, y pluralizar ideas sobre el cambio no se verá beneficiada por una esencia nacional en la forma de una categoría o una narrativa. Esta reflexión corresponde, por lo tanto, a las inquietudes sobre la pluralidad de las identidades de los estudiantes en las sociedades multiculturales y en las aulas de Historia (Grever, 2012; Seixas, 2012; Tutiaux-Guillon, 2012). Una sola versión nacional del pasado no beneficia a la comprensión histórica ni a la participación en una sociedad compleja y plural. Así, el énfasis en la construcción de identidades cívicas y pluralistas también debe tener cuidado con las versiones homogeneizadas del pasado y con las identidades esencialistas. Los interrogantes '¿qué entendemos por "nosotros"?' y '¿de quién son los objetivos que están representados?' aún son aplicables. De nuevo, la identidad no debe ser impuesta o darse por sentada. En lugar de apuntar a una identidad cívica a construirse, es decir, seguir pensando en términos de entidades impuestas, la participación cívica de los estudiantes puede ser facilitado, es decir, ser concebido como proceso en lo cual ellos toman un rol activo. Tal vez, la enseñanza de la Historia no deberá preocuparse tanto por la construcción de la identidad, ya que los estudiantes son los que en última instancia se identifican o participan. Su rol activo se estudia y describe mejor con verbos que con sustantivos, y sus acciones son facilitadas más que sus identidades determinadas. Inevitablemente, los estudiantes traen al aula sus valores y recuerdos. En lugar de preguntar si debería ser tarea de la enseñanza de la Historia corregir o fomentar estos valores y recuerdos, podrían ser tomados como una fuente entre otras (Moller, 2012). La enseñanza de la Historia puede entonces contribuir a los puntos de vista alternativos, cambiantes o extranjeros para la comprensión del pasado. Además, puede invitar a

la comparación entre estos relatos alternativos, del mismo modo en que se comparan las distintas fuentes. Por lo tanto, podría ofrecer a los estudiantes una herramienta que no sólo es útil sino necesaria en el vertiginoso mundo de (des)información actual. La escuela es uno de los pocos contextos en los que los estudiantes todavía pueden aprender a analizar y desarmar la retórica política, los medios de comunicación tendenciosos o las estrategias de marketing. ¿Dónde más puede practicarse de manera accesible la recepción crítica de información? ¿No hay ya suficiente espacio afuera de la escuela para repetir acríticamente de las versiones oficiales y colectivas? En este sentido, sería útil pensar en lo que la enseñanza de la Historia no necesita hacer. Ya hay tantas cosas que se supone que debe hacer.

Como se vio en los estudios sobre aprendizaje de la Historia, los participantes se aferran a sus valores, perspectivas y explicaciones cuando se les ofrece explicaciones alternativas (Barton, 2008; Limón & Carretero, 1999; Seixas & Clark, 2004). Su apego emocional a la categoría o Historia nacional puede, entonces, resistirse a las reflexiones que se acaban de exponer. Considerar la historicidad de la nación y la identidad nacional también es una herramienta cultural que posee un objetivo inherente que no necesariamente coincide con los objetivos o valores de un agente, ni beneficiar a todos los agentes posibles. Este tipo de reflexión sobre la identidad y la narrativa que la sostiene no favorece a la apremiante agenda social de los grupos discriminados y marginados (Hammack, 2010). La auto-categorización y la identificación son fundamentales para los movimientos de emancipación y para aquellos que necesiten fortalecer su posición para conseguir un futuro mejor. Sin embargo, una consideración histórica y dinámica de la nación y de la identidad nacional es más acogedora para versiones alternativas del pasado y sus identidades correspondientes que una narrativa maestra dominante y excluyente. En ese sentido, la comprensión histórica disciplinaria es más inclusiva hacia las perspectivas nuevas y extranjeras, que la celebración de una sola narrativa oficial. En la enseñanza de la Historia permanecen las tensiones complejas, entre la emancipación y la contemplación, entre la memoria colectiva y la historiografía, entre el aprecio por el pasado como tal y la construcción en vistas al futuro. Sin embargo, una comprensión histórica que esté abierta a las contribuciones de la memoria colectiva y una memoria colectiva que vaya más allá de una memoria nacional estrecha, otorgan alguna perspectiva.

HACIA UNA COMPRENSIÓN INCLUSIVA DE LA HISTORIA

La tensión en la enseñanza de la Historia, que vacila entre el amor al país y el conocimiento disciplinar de su pasado, se halla en una discusión más amplia entre las diferentes posturas de identificación y las diferentes maneras de conocer la historia. Además de la identificación nacional, hay una identificación ciudadana, una identificación étnica, una identificación local, una

identificación global, una identificación personal, una identificación de género. Aparte de los diferentes enfoques de la historiografía, existe la Historia escolar, la memoria colectiva, el patrimonio, la historia oral, la historia familiar. Las diferentes posturas y tipos de conocimiento se relacionan de muchas maneras. En la historiografía también hubo afiliación a las posturas de identificación. En este sentido, hay una discusión continua entre los perjuicios y los beneficios de la memoria patrimonial y colectiva y, las virtudes y los vicios de la historiografía. La historiografía produjo relatos críticos, pero también contribuyó a la Historia oficial (Berger, 2012). La memoria colectiva está comprometida y es olvidadiza, pero también corrigió la Historia oficial (Le Goff, 1992). La educación patrimonial nacional que invite a la identificación podría mejorar la comprensión histórica de manera significativa (Grever, de Bruijn & van Boxtel, 2012), siempre que no realce a una única representación narrativa o gloriosa del pasado nacional. Por otro parte, el enfoque supuestamente universal de la Historia global, puede ser el disfraz de un punto de vista sesgado tradicional de la historia (Tutiaux-Guillon, 2012). Al mismo tiempo, reconocer las muchas y diferentes fuentes formales e informales de aprendizaje de la Historia se corresponde bastante bien con la variedad de perspectivas reconocidas en la historiografía contemporánea (Burke, 2001; Moller, 2012). Como puede verse en los capítulos 4 y 5, enfocarse en la comprensión histórica de la nación no implica automáticamente la desacreditación del valor de la memoria y de la identificación o viceversa. La consideración de otras posturas de identificación y de conocimiento de la Historia, puede contribuir a una comprensión histórica que vaya más allá de la narrativa maestra.

En el capítulo 4, los recuerdos de los militantes sandinistas aportan otra perspectiva a las versiones oficiales y de los medios de comunicación sobre la historia reciente de Nicaragua. En una línea similar, las narrativas de los militantes políticos se incorporaron en la memoria colectiva argentina. Los ‘subversivos’, según los relatos oficiales en la dictadura, fueron capaces de redefinirse a sí mismos no sólo como víctimas del terrorismo de Estado, sino como militantes políticos activos. Es así como las nuevas perspectivas contribuyen a cómo se recuerdan las dictaduras de América Latina y como la memoria colectiva ayuda a dar sentido al pasado reciente (Jelin, 2003). Por otra parte, el capítulo 5 muestra cómo la memoria colectiva sobre los mismos actores históricos es muy diferente en los grupos militantes políticos de América Latina y en grupos en la antigua Unión Soviética. Los monumentos se levantan o se destruyen en función de cómo se evalúa a la ideología marxista-leninista o en qué contexto son erigidos. En la ex Unión Soviética, para muchas personas que experimentaron al comunismo, el marxismo-leninismo simboliza la opresión, en México y en muchos otros países de América Latina simboliza la liberación de los marginados y los empobrecidos a causa de un sistema político económico heredado del colonialismo. La recuperación de la memoria colectiva en Europa del este significó dar voz a las perspectivas silenciados por la narrativa maestra soviética (Brossat et

al., 1992). Las experiencias con el marxismo-leninismo en una parte del mundo son olvidadas más o menos selectivamente en otras partes del mundo, aunque podrían ser recordadas y comparadas en simultáneo, cosa que no suele suceder.

El capítulo 5 sugiere un intercambio entre la memoria colectiva y la historiografía que no equivale a una memoria formateada de manera nacional y estrecha, sino que propone ampliar la memoria colectiva más allá de los formatos nacionales, para incluir la comparación de una variedad de perspectivas sobre la Historia. Citando a Le Goff:

La memoria es una conquista, debe buscar y conservar aquello que le permita construirse desde la perspectiva de la verdad. Debe disipar las falsas leyendas, negras o doradas, en torno de tal episodio del pasado, recopilar el máximo de documentos y confrontar las memorias contradictorias, hacer abrir los archivos e impedir su destrucción, saber ir a buscar en la literatura o el arte la memoria expulsada hacia los tabúes de la historia durante ciertas épocas en ciertos sistemas, reconocer la pluralidad de las memorias legítimas. (1992, p. 15)

La historiografía y las memorias colectivas pueden construir una sola narrativa maestra del pasado, pero también pueden contribuir a la apertura del pasado: a través de la investigación se puede disponer de múltiples nuevas perspectivas. Estas también corresponden a una variedad de posturas de identificación. Una sola perspectiva dominante limita la comprensión del pasado, mientras que la variedad de perspectivas ofrece un acceso abierto al pasado, como también se ha reconocido en la 'nueva historia' ('new history', Burke, 2001). El olvido o la manipulación selectiva de la historia pueden ser contrarrestados con el abordaje y la comparación de estas perspectivas diferentes. La apertura del pasado también puede implicar la identificación con perspectivas ajenas en lugar de confirmar el status quo nacional. Como tal, es una actividad de participación cívica, de empatía y reflexión moral, al servicio de una comprensión histórica inclusiva. De hecho, ¿la participación cívica, lo es realmente si no trasciende las fronteras nacionales?

Al abrirse a nuevas versiones alternativas y múltiples perspectivas, las narrativas maestras de diferentes partes del mundo pueden ser comparadas e interrogadas. Pero, ¿existe una manera de incluir una variedad de perspectivas y su comparación histórica en las narrativas mismas? Las representaciones narrativas son muy fácilmente consideradas *como* el pasado, y sus tramas y protagonistas suelen excluir a los demás. Sin embargo, las narrativas pueden acomodarse a los cambios históricos y a una variedad de perspectivas. Las narrativas que permiten a esta complejidad ya se desarrollaron en la literatura y en las películas contemporáneas (Burke, 2001). En estos relatos, muchas identidades diferentes pueden construirse en simultáneo, o más bien, diferentes tipos de identificación pueden ser facilitados gracias a su multiplicidad. Y ¿puede

una narrativa sobre la Historia de la nación integrar la comprensión histórica y la construcción de identidades? Si la narrativa incluye protagonistas heterogéneos en una compleja serie de acontecimientos relacionados entre sí, en un mundo que es constantemente reconfigurado, podría alojar muchos procesos de identificación diferentes. El presente plural puede reflejarse en la narrativa plural, como un pasado abierto da lugar a un futuro abierto. Finalmente, dada la extranjería y la indeterminación del futuro, podría ser más útil abrazar el pasado extranjero e indeterminado.

REFERENCIAS

- Abowitz, K. K. (2002). Imagining citizenship: Cosmopolitanism or patriotism? *Teachers College Record*, 12. Accessed June 19, 2014: <http://www.tcrecord.org/content.asp?contentid=11008>
- The Academy of Korean Studies (2005). *Nationalism and history textbooks in Asia and Europe*. Seoul, South Korea: Author.
- Afflerbach, P. & VanSledright, B. A. (2001). Hath! Doth! What? Middle graders reading innovative history text. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 44, 696–707.
- Ahonen, A. (1997). A transformation of history: The official representations of history in East Germany and Estonia, 1986-1991. *Culture and Psychology*, 3, 41-62.
- Alcoff, L. M. & Mendieta, E. (2003). *Identities. Race, class, gender, and nationality*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Alridge, D. P. (2006). The limits of master narratives in history textbooks: An analysis of representations of Martin Luther King, Jr. *Teachers College Record*, 108(4), 662–686.
- Alvarez Junco, J. (2011). *Spanish Identity in the Age of Nations*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.
- Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. Revised Edition. London, UK: Verso. [First published 1983.]
- Asensio, M. & Pol, E. (in preparation). *Una evaluación previa sobre el Museo de la Revolución en Nicaragua [A preliminary evaluation of the Museum of the Revolution in Nicaragua]*. León, Nicaragua: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Nicaragua.
- Bailey, N. (1742). *An universal etymological English dictionary containing an additional collection of words*. Volume 2 (3rd edn.). London, UK: Cox.
- Ballantyne, T. (2005). Putting the nation in its place?: World history and C. A. Bayly's 'The birth of the modern world'. In A. Curthoys & M. Lake (Eds.), *Connected Worlds: History in transnational perspective* (pp. 23-44). Canberra, Australia: ANU E press.
- Bamberg, M. (2009). Identity and narration. In P. Huehn, J. Pier, W. Schmid & J. Schoenert (Eds.), *Handbook of narratology*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Bamberg, M. (2011). Narrative discourse. In C.A. Chapelle (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Bamberg, M., DeFina, A. & Schiffrin, D. (Eds.) (2007). Selves and identities in narrative and discourse (pp.253-271). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Barrett, M. (2007). *Children's knowledge, beliefs and feelings about nations and national groups*. Hove, UK: Psychology Press.
- Barrett, M. & Buchanan-Barrow, E. (Eds.) (2005). *Children's understanding of society*. London, UK: Taylor & Francis.

- Barton, K. C. (2001). A sociocultural perspective on children's understanding of historical change: Comparative findings from Northern Ireland and the United States. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38, 881–913.
- Barton, K. C. (2002). "Oh, That's a tricky piece!": Children, mediated action, and the tools of historical time. *Elementary School Journal*, 103(2), 161–185.
- Barton, K. C. (2008). Research on students' ideas about history. In L. Levstik & C. A. Thyson (Eds.), *Handbook of research on social studies education* (pp. 239–258). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Barton, K. C. & Levstik, L. S. (1998). "It wasn't a good part of history": Ambiguity and identity in middle grade students' judgments of historical significance. *Teachers College Record*, 99, 478–513.
- Barton, K. C. & Levstik, L. S. (2004). *Teaching history for the common good*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Barton, K. C. & Levstik, L. S. (2008). History. In J. Arthur, C. Hahn & I. Davies (Eds.), *Handbook of education for citizenship and democracy*. London, UK: Sage.
- Barton, K. C. & McCully, A. W. (2005). History, identity, and the school curriculum in Northern Ireland: An empirical study of secondary students' ideas and perspectives. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 37, 85–116.
- Bellino, M. J. & Selman, B. L. (2012). The intersection of historical understanding and ethical reflection during early adolescence. A place where time is squared. In M. Carretero, M. Asensio & M. Rodriguez-Moneo (Eds.), *History education and the construction of national identities* (pp. 189–202). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Berger, S. (2011). Le "Tournant Linguistique" en Histoire: une perspective Anglo-Saxonne [The Linguistic Turn in History: an Anglo-Saxon perspective], *Diogenes*, 229–230, 6–29.
- Berger, S. (2012). De-nationalizing history teaching and nationalizing it differently! Some reflections on how to defuse the negative potential of national(ist) history teaching. In M. Carretero, M. Asensio & M. Rodriguez-Moneo (Eds.), *History education and the construction of national identities* (pp. 33–47). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Berger, S., & Conrad, C. (2015). *The past as history: Historical consciousness and national identity in modern Europe*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Berry, J. W. (1980). Acculturation as varieties of adaptation. In A. Padilla (Ed.), *Acculturation: Theory, models and some new findings* (pp. 9–25). Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Berti, A. E. & Andriolo, A. (2001). Third graders' understanding of core political concepts (law, nation-state, government) before and after teaching. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs*, 127(4), 346–377.
- Bertoni, L. A. (2001). *Patriotas, cosmopolitas y nacionalistas. La construcción de la nacionalidad argentina a fines del siglo XIX*. [Patriots, cosmopolitans and nationalists. The construction of the Argentine nationality at the end of the 19th century]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Fondo de Cultura Economica.
- Bevernage, B. & Lorenz, C. (2013). *Breaking up Time: Negotiating the Borders Between Present, Past and Future*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

- Bietti, L. M. (2010). The construction of the moral self in autobiographical memory: being an 'ordinary' man within the experience of dictatorship in Argentina. In S. Salvatore, J. Valsiner, J. B. Travers Simon, A. Gennaro (Eds.), *YIS: Yearbook of idiographic science—Volume 3*. (pp. 253–273). Rome, Italy: Firera & Liuzzo Publishing Group.
- Billig, M. (1995). *Banal nationalism*. London, UK: Sage.
- Bjerg, H. (Ed.) (2011). *Historicizing the Uses of the Past: Scandinavian Perspectives on History Culture, Historical Consciousness and Didactics of History Related to World War II (Time - Meaning - Culture)*. Bielefeld, Germany: Transcript-Verlag.
- Bloch, M. (1953). *The historians craft*. New York, NY: Vintage Books - Random House.
- Bowker, G. C. & Star, S. L. (2002). *Sorting things out: Classification and its consequences*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Brockmeier, J. (2010). After the Archive. Remapping memory. *Culture and Psychology*, 16, 5-35.
- Brophy, J. & VanSledright, B. A. (1997). *Teaching and learning history in elementary schools*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Brossat, A., Combe, S., Potel, J. & Szurek, J. (Eds.) (1992). *En el este, la memoria recuperada*. Valencia, Spain: Edicions Alfons el Magnànim. [First published 1990, *A l'Est, la memoire retrouvée*. Paris, France: Éditions La Découverte.]
- Bruner, J. (1990). *Acts of meaning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Burke, P. (2001) Ed. *New perspectives on historical writing*. London, UK: Polity
- Burke, P. (2005). *History and Social Theory* (2nd edn.). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press
- Carr, E. H. (1961). *What is history?* London, UK: Macmillan.
- Carretero, M. (2011). *Constructing patriotism. Teaching history and memories in global worlds*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Carretero, M., Asensio, M. & Pozo, J. I. (1991). Cognitive development, historical time representation and causal explanations in adolescence. In M. Carretero, M. Pope, R. J. Simons & J. I. Pozo. (Eds.), *Learning and instruction. Vol.III. European research in an international context* (pp. 27–48). Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press.
- Carretero, M., Asensio, M. & Rodriguez-Moneo, M. (Eds.). (2012). *History education and the construction of national identities*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Carretero, M. & Bermudez, A. (2012). Constructing histories. In J. Valsiner (Ed.), *Oxford handbook of culture and psychology* (pp. 625–646). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Carretero, M., Castorina, J. A. & Levinas, M. L. (2013). Conceptual change and historical narratives about the nation: A theoretical and empirical approach. In S. Vosniadou (Ed.), *International handbook of research on conceptual change* (pp. 269–287). (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Carretero, M. & Gonzalez, M. F. (2008). "Aquí vemos a Colón llegando a América." Desarrollo cognitivo e interpretación de imágenes históricas. ["Here we see Columbus arriving to America." Cognitive development and interpretation of historical images.] *Cultura y Educación*, 20(2), 217–227.

- Carretero, M., Haste, H. & Bermudez, A. (in press). Civic Education. In A. Anderman & L. Corno (Eds.), *Third Handbook on Educational Psychology*. New York, NY: Taylor and Francis.
- Carretero, M., Jacott, L. & Lopez-Manjon, A. (2002). Learning history through textbooks: are Mexican and Spanish students taught the same story? *Learning and Instruction*, 12, 651-665.
- Carretero, M. & Kriger, M. (2010). Enseñanza de la historia e identidad nacional a través de las efemérides escolares. In Carretero, M. & Castorina, J.A. La construcción del conocimiento histórico. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Paidós.
- Carretero, M. & Kriger, M. (2011). Historical representations and conflicts about indigenous people as national identities. *Culture and Psychology*, 17(2), 177-195.
- Carretero, M. & Lee, P. (2014). Learning Historical Concepts. In K. Sawyer (Ed.), *Handbook of Learning Sciences* (2nd edn.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Carretero, M., Lopez, C., Gonzalez, M. F. & Rodriguez Moneo, M. (2012). Students historical narratives and concepts about the nation. In M. Carretero, M. Asensio & M. Rodriguez Moneo (Eds.) *History education and the construction of national identities* (pp. 153-170). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Carretero, M., Lopez-Manjon, A. & Jacott, L. (1997). Explaining historical events. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 27(3), 245-253.
- Carretero, M., Rosa, A. & Gonzalez, M. F. (2006). Enseñar historia en tiempos de memoria [Teaching history in times of memory]. In M. Carretero, A. Rosa & M. F. Gonzalez (Eds.), *Enseñanza de la historia y memoria colectiva [History teaching and collective memory]* (pp. 13-38). Buenos Aires, Argentina: Paidós.
- Carretero, M. & Solcoff, K. (2012). Commentary on Brockmeier's remapping memory: The relation between past, present and future as a metaphor of memory. *Culture and Psychology*, 18(1), 14-22.
- Carretero, M. & van Alphen, F. (2014). Do master narratives change among high school students? A characterization of how national history is represented, *Cognition and Instruction*, 32(3), 290-312, doi: 10.1080/07370008.2014.919298
- Carretero, M. & van Alphen, F. (in press). History, Collective Memories or National Memories? How the representation of the past is framed by master narratives. In B. Wagoner (Ed.) *Oxford Handbook of Culture and Memory*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Carretero, M. & Voss, J.F. (Eds.) (1994). *Cognitive and Instructional Processes in History and Social Sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Castorina, J.A., Carretero, M., Barreiro, A., Van Alphen, F. & Sarti, M. (2015). Historical narrative and concepts: Delimitations and possible perspectives. In J. Cresswell, A. Haye, A. Larrain, M. Morgan, G. Sullivan (Eds.), *Dialogue and debate in the making of theoretical psychology*. Toronto, Canada: Captus University Publication.
- Cercadillo, L. (2001). Significance in history: Students' ideas in England and Spain. In A. Dickinson, P. Gordon & P. Lee (Eds.), *International review of history education: Vol. 3. Raising standards in history education* (pp. 116-145). Portland, OR: Woburn Press.

- Chiaramonte, J. C. (2013). *Usos políticos de la historia: lenguaje de clases y revisionismo histórico*. [The political use of history: language of classes and revisionism.] Buenos Aires, Argentina: Editorial Sudamericana.
- Chiaramonte, J. (1989). Formas de identidad en el Río de la Plata luego de 1810. [Forms of identity in the River Plate after 1810]. *Boletín del Instituto de Historia Argentina y Americana "Dr. E. Ravignani"* 3(1), 71–92.
- Chiaramonte, J. (1991). El mito de los orígenes en la historiografía latinoamericana. [The myth of the origins in Latinamerican historiography]. *Cuadernos del Instituto Ravignani*, 2, 5–39.
- Cristofori, A. (Ed.) (2010). *Historia 2. América y Europa entre los siglos XV y XVIII. La Argentina: Desde la Revolución de Mayo hasta mediados del siglo XIX*. [History 2. America and Europe between the 15th and 18th century. Argentina: From the May Revolution until the middle of the 19th century]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Aique.
- Connerton, P. (1989). *How societies remember*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Danziger, K. (1999). Natural kinds, human kinds and historicity. In W. Maiers, B. Bayer, B. Duarte Esgalhado, R. Jorna, & E. Schraube (Eds.), *Challenges to theoretical psychology* (pp. 78–83). Ontario, Canada: Captus Press Inc.
- Del Barrio, C., Hoyos, O., Padilla, M. L. & Lara, L. (2013). La sociedad y el yo en la construcción de la identidad nacional. *Estudios de Psicología: Studies in Psychology*, 34(1), 49–59, doi: 10.1174/021093913805403066
- Duveen, G. & Gilligan, C. (2013). On interviews: A conversation with Carol Gilligan. In S. Jovchelovitch and B. Wagoner (Eds.), *Development as social process: Contributions of Gerard Duveen* (pp. 124–131). London, UK: Routledge.
- Egan, K. (1997). *The educated mind*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Epstein, T. L. (2000). Adolescents' perspectives on racial diversity in U.S. history: Case studies from an urban classroom. *American Educational Research Journal*, 37, 185–214.
- Epstein, T. & Schiller, J. (2005). Perspective matters: Social identity and the teaching and learning of national history. *Social Education*, 69(4), 201–204.
- Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity: youth and crisis*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Ferro, M. (1984). *The use and abuse of history, or, how the past is taught to children*. London, UK: Routledge. [Revised French edition 2002. Paris, France: PUF]
- Fischer, D.H. (1970). *Historians' fallacies : Toward a logic of historical thought*. NY: Harper & Row.
- Foster, S. (2012). Re-thinking historical textbooks in a globalised world. In M. Carretero, M. Asensio & M. Rodriguez-Moneo (Eds.), *History education and the construction of national identities* (pp. 49–62). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Foster, S. J. & Crawford, K. A. (Eds.) (2006). *What shall we tell the children? International perspectives on school history textbooks*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. London, UK: Penguin.

- Foucault, M. (1999). Nietzsche, genealogy, history. In M. Foucault, P. Rabinow, & R. Hurley (Eds.), *Aesthetics, method, and epistemology. Essential works of Foucault, 1954–1984, volume II*. New York, NY: The New Press.
- Gellner, E. (1978). *Thought and change*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Gillis, J. R. (1994). Memory and identity: The history of a relationship. In J. R. Gillis (Ed.), *Commemorations: The politics of national identity* (pp. 3–24). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Giordano, V. (Ed.) (2012). *Historia. Expansión del capitalismo y formación de los Estados nacionales en América Latina*. [History. The expansion of capitalism and formation of nation states in Latin America]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Santillana.
- Glaveanu, V. & Yamamoto, K. (2012). Bridging history and social psychology: What, how and why. *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, 46, 431–439. doi: 10.1007/s12124-012-9213-z
- Goldberg, T. (2013). “It’s in my veins”: Identity and disciplinary practice in students’ discussions of a historical issue. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 41(1), 33–64.
- Goldberg, T., Baruch, B. B. & Porat, D. (2011). “Could they do it differently?”: Narrative and argumentative changes in students’ writing following discussion of “hot” historical issues. *Cognition and Instruction*, 29(2), 185–217.
- Gonzalez, M. F. & Carretero, M. (2013). Historical narratives and arguments in the context of identity conflicts. *Estudios de Psicología*, 34(1), 73–82.
- Gonzalez de Oleaga, M. (2012). Historical narratives in the colonial, national and ethnic museums of Argentina, Paraguay and Spain. In M. Carretero, M. Asensio & M. Rodriguez-Moneo (Eds.), *History education and the construction of national identities* (pp. 239–255). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Gottlieb, E. & Wineburg, S. (2012). Between veritas and communitas: Epistemic switching in the reading of academic and sacred history. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 21(1), 84–129.
- Grever, M. (2012). Dilemma’s of common and plural history. Reflections on history education and heritage in a globalizing world. In M. Carretero, M. Asensio & M. Rodriguez-Moneo (Eds.), *History education and the construction of national identities* (pp. 75–91). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Grever, M., de Bruijn, P. & van Boxtel, C. (2012). Negotiating historical distance: Or, how to deal with the past as a foreign country in heritage education. *Paedagogica Historica: International Journal of the History of Education*, 48, 873–887. doi: 10.1080/00309230.2012.709527
- Grever, M., Pelzer, B. & Haydn, T. (2011). High school students’ views on history. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 43, 207–229. doi: 10.1080/00220272.2010.542832
- Grever, M. & Stuurman, S. (2007). *Beyond the canon: History for the 21st century*. Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan.
- Grimson, A. (Ed.) (2007). *Pasiones nacionales. Política y cultura en Brasil y Argentina*. [National Passions. Politics and culture in Brasil and Argentina.] Buenos Aires, Argentina: Edhasa.

- Hacking, I. (1986). Making up People. In T. C. Heller, M. Sosna and D. E. Wellbery (Eds.), *Reconstructing Individualism*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Hacking, I. (1995). The looping effects of human kinds. In D. Sperber, D. Premack, & A. Premack (Eds.), *Causal cognition: An interdisciplinary approach* (pp. 351–383). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Hacking, I. (1999). *The Social Construction of What?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hacking, I. (2002). *Historical Ontology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Halbwachs, M. (1992). *On collective memory*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press. [Edited and translated from *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire*, published 1952, and *La topographie légendaire des évangiles en terre sainte: Etude de mémoire collective*, published in 1941. Paris: France: Presses Universitaires de France.]
- Halldén, O. (1998). Personalization in historical descriptions and explanations. *Learning and Instruction*, 8(2), 131-139.
- Hammack, P. (2008). Narrative and the Cultural Psychology of Identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 12, 222-247. doi: 10.1177/1088868308316892
- Hammack, P. (2010). Identity as burden or benefit? Youth, historical narrative, and the legacy of political conflict. *Human Development*, 53, 173–201.
- Hansen, J. (2012). De-nationalize history and what have we done? Ontology, essentialism, and the search for a cosmopolitan alternative. In M. Carretero, M. Asensio & M. Rodriguez-Moneo (Eds.), *History education and the construction of national identities* (pp. 153-170). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Haste, H. & Hogan, A. (2012). The future shapes the present: Scenarios, metaphors and civic action. In M. Carretero, M. Asensio & M. Rodriguez-Moneo (Eds.), *History education and the construction of national identities* (pp. 311-326). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Heller, A. (2006). European master narratives about freedom. In G. Delanty (Ed.), *Handbook of contemporary European social theory* (pp. 257–265). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hobsbawm, E. J. (1992). *Nations and nationalism since 1780: Programme, myth, reality*. (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hobsbawm, E. & Ranger, T. (2004). *The invention of tradition*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. [First published 1983.]
- Hogan, P. C. (2009). *Understanding nationalism : on narrative, cognitive science, and identity*. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University Press.
- Hoyos, O. & del Barrio, C. (2006). El significado cognitivo y afectivo de la identidad nacional en niños y adolescentes colombianos y españoles. In M. Carretero, A. Rosa y F. González (Eds.) *Enseñanza de la historia y memoria colectiva* (pp. 145-168). Buenos Aires, Argentina: Paidós.
- Iriye, A. & Saunier, P.Y. (Eds.) (2009). *The Palgrave dictionary of transnational history*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jelin, E. (2003). *State repression and the labors of memory*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

- Jovchelovitch, S. (2012). Narrative, Memory and Social Representations: A Conversation Between History and Social Psychology. *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, 46, 440–456. doi: 10.1007/s12124-012-9217-8
- Kaviraj, S. (1992). The imaginary institution of India. In S. Amin & G. Pandey (Eds.), *Subaltern studies VII. Writings on South Asian history and society* (pp. 1-39). Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Knell, S. J., Aronson, P., et al. (Eds.) (2011). *National museums. New studies from around the world*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Knights, M. (2012). Taking a historical turn: Possible points of connection between social psychology and history. *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, 46, 584-598. doi: 10.1007/s12124-012-9211-1
- Kolikant, Y. B. & Pollack, S. (2009). The asymmetrical influence of identity: a triadic interaction among Israeli Jews, Israeli Arabs, and historical texts. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 41, 651-677.
- Koselleck, R. (1975). *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe*. [Basic concepts of history]. Stuttgart, Germany: Klett-Cotta. [Spanish translation 2004. *historia/Historia*, Madrid, Spain: Trotta].
- Koselleck, R. (1996). A response to comments on the geschichtliche grundbegriffe. In H. Lehmann & M. Richter (Eds.) *The Meaning of historical terms and concepts* (pp. 59–70). Retrieved February 19, 2012: <http://www.ghi-dc.org/publications/ghipubs/op/op15.pdf>
- Koselleck, R. (2004). *Futures past. On the semantics of historical time*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Lee, P. (2004). "Walking backwards into tomorrow": Historical consciousness and understanding of history. *International Journal of Historical Learning, Teaching and Research*, 4(1). Retrieved January 23, 2015: <http://centres.exeter.ac.uk/historyresource/journal7/lee.pdf>
- Lee, P. J. (2005). Putting principles into practice: Understanding history. In M. S. Donovan & J. D. Bransford (Eds.), *How students learn history in the classroom*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- Lee, P. J. (2007). From national canon to historical literacy. In M. Grever & S. Stuurman (Eds.), *Beyond the canon: History for the twenty-first century* (pp. 31-47). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lee, P. J. & Ashby, R. (2000). Progression in historical understanding among students ages 7–14. In P. Stearns, P. Seixas & S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing, teaching, and learning history* (pp. 199–222). New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Lee, P. & Ashby, R. (2001). Empathy, perspective taking, and rational understanding. In O. L. Davis, Jr., E. A. Yeager & S. J. Foster (Eds.), *Historical empathy and perspective taking in the social studies* (pp. 21–50). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Lee, P., Dickinson, A. K. & Ashby, R. (1997). "Just another emperor": Understanding action in the past. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 27, 233–244.
- Lee, P. & Shemilt, D. (2011). The concept that dares not speak its name: Should empathy come out of the closet? *Teaching History*, 143, 39–48.

- Le Goff, J. (1992). Prefacio. In A. Brossat, S. Combe, J. Potel, J. Szurek (Eds.), *En el este, la memoria recuperada* (pp. 11-17). Valencia, Spain: Edicions Alfons el Magnànim. [First published 1990, *A l'Est, la memoire retrouvée*. Paris, France: Éditions La Découverte.]
- Le Goff, J. & Nora, P. (1985). *Constructing the past*. Cambridge, UK : Cambridge University Press. [First published 1974, *Faire de l'histoire*. Paris, France: Gallimard]
- Leinhardt, G. & Ravi, A. (2013). Changing Historical Conceptions of History. In S. Vosniadou (Ed.), *International handbook of research on conceptual change* (pp. 253-268) (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lévesque, S. (2008). *Thinking historically: Educating students for the 21st century*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Levi, G. & Revel, J. (Eds.) (2002). *Political Uses of the Past. The Recent Mediterranean Experiences*. NY: Routledge.
- Levintova, E. (2010). Past imperfect: The construction of history in the school curriculum and mass media in post-communist Russia and Ukraine. *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*, 43, 125-127. doi: 10.1016/j.postcomstud.2010.03.005
- Levstik, L. S. & Groth, J. (2005). "Ruled by our own people": Ghanaian adolescents' conceptions of citizenship. *Teachers College Record*, 107, 563-586.
- Licata, L. & Mercy, A. (in press). Collective Memory (Social Psychology of). In *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioural Sciences* (2nd edn.). New York, NY: Elsevier.
- Limón, M. & Carretero, M. (1999). Conflicting data and conceptual change in history experts. In W. Schnotz, S. Vosniadou & M. Carretero (Eds.), *New perspectives on conceptual change* (pp. 137-159). New York, NY: Pergamon.
- Liu, J. H., et al. (2012). Cross-cultural dimensions of meaning in the evaluation of events in world history? Perceptions of historical calamities and progress in cross-cultural data from thirty societies. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 43 (2), 251-272. doi: 10.1177/0022022110390926
- Liu, J. H. & Hilton, D. J. (2005). How the past weighs on the present: Social representations of history and their role in identity politics. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 44, 537-556.
- Lopez, C. & Carretero, M. (2012). Identity construction and the goals of history education. In M. Carretero, M. Asensio & M. Rodriguez-Moneo (Eds.), *History education and the construction of national identities* (pp. 139-150). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Lopez, C., Carretero, M. & Rodriguez-Moneo, M. (2014 a). Conquest or reconquest? Students' conceptions of nation embedded in a historical narrative. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 23(3). doi: 10.1080/10508406.2014.919863
- Lopez, C., Carretero, M. & Rodriguez-Moneo, M. (2014 b). Telling a national narrative that's not your own. Does it enable disciplinary historical understanding? *Culture & Psychology*, 20, 547-571. doi: 10.1177/1354067X14554156.
- Lowenthal, D. (2000). Dilemmas and delights of learning history. In Stearns, P. N., Seixas, P. & Wineburg, S. (Eds.), *Knowing, teaching, and learning history: National and international perspectives* (pp. 63-82). New York, NY: New York University Press.

- Lowenthal, D. (1985). *The past is a foreign country*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Lynch, J. (2009). *San Martin: Argentine soldier, American hero*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Matusov, E. & Smith, M. P. (2012). The middle-class nature of identity and its implications for education: A genealogical analysis and reevaluation of a culturally and historically bounded concept. *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, 46(3). doi: 10.1007/s12124-012-9192-0.
- Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self, and society*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Megill, A. (2007). *Historical knowledge, historical error: A contemporary guide to practice*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Millstone, N. (2012). Historicising common sense. *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, 46, 529-543. doi: 10.1007/s12124-012-9222-y
- Moller, S. (2012). Are family recollections an obstacle to history education? How German students make sense of the East German dictatorship. In M. Carretero, M. Asensio & M. Rodriguez-Moneo (Eds.), *History education and the construction of national identities* (pp. 281-295). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Monte-Sano, C. (2010). Disciplinary Literacy in History: An Exploration of the Historical Nature of Adolescents' Writing. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 19 (4), 539-568.
- Murakami, K. (2012). History as a dynamic process: Reanalyzing a case of Anglo-Japanese reconciliation. In M. Carretero, M. Asensio & M. Rodriguez-Moneo (Eds.), *History education and the construction of national identities* (pp. 297-310). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Murray, J. A. H.; Philological Society, London (1888). *A new English dictionary on historical principles founded mainly on the materials collected by the Philological Society. Volume 5, Pt.2*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.
- Nakou, I. & Barca, I. (Eds.) (2010). *Contemporary public debates over history education*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Nora, P. (1984-1992). *Les lieux de Mémoire* (7 volumes). Paris, France: Gallimard.
- Nussbaum, M. & Cohen, J. (2002). *For love of country?: A new democracy forum on the limits of patriotism*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Ortemberg, P. (2013). *El origen de las fiestas patrias. Hispanoamérica en la era de las independencias*. [The origin of patriotic rituals. Latin America in the age of the independences.] Rosario, Argentina: Prohistoria Ediciones.
- Penuel, W. R. & Wertsch, J. V. (2000). Historical representation as mediated action: Official history as a tool. In J. F. Voss & M. Carretero (Eds.), *Learning and reasoning in history: International review of history education* (Vol. 2, pp. 23-38). London, UK: Routledge.
- Pigna, F. I. (2009). *Los mitos de la historia Argentina 1*. [The myths of Argentine history]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Planeta.

- Polkinghorne, D. E. (2005). Narrative psychology and historical consciousness: Relationships and perspectives. In J. Straub (Ed.), *Narration, identity and historical consciousness* (pp. 3-22). New York, NY: Berghahn Books.
- Reicher, S. & Hopkins, N. (2001). *Self and Nation*. London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Ricoeur, P. (2004). *Memory, history, forgetting*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press
- Ricoeur, P. (1992). *Oneself as another*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Ricoeur, P. (1990). *Time and narrative*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Rios Saloma, M.F. (2005). From the Restoration to the Reconquest: The construction of a national myth. *En la España medieval*, 28, 379-414.
- Rivière, A., Núñez, B. B. & Fontela, F. (1998). Influence of intentional and personal factors in recalling historical texts: A developmental perspective. In J. F. Voss & M. Carretero (Eds.), *International review of history education, Vol. 2: Learning and reasoning in history* (pp. 214-226). Portland, OR: Woburn Press.
- Rochat, P. (2009). *Others in mind: Social origins of self-consciousness*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Romero, L. A. (Ed.) (2004). *La Argentina en la Escuela. La idea de nación en los textos escolares* [Argentina at school. The idea of nation in school texts]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Siglo Veintiuno Editores.
- Rosa, A. (2012). What history to teach? Whose history? In M. Carretero, M. Asensio & M. Rodríguez-Moneo (Eds.), *History education and the construction of national identities* (pp. 63-72). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Rosa, A. (2006). Recordar, describir y explicar el pasado, ¿Qué, cómo, y para el futuro de quién? [Remembering, describing and explaining the past: What, how and for the future of whom?] In M. Carretero, A. Rosa & M. F. González (Eds.), *Enseñanza de la historia y memoria colectiva* [History teaching and collective memory] (pp. 41-51). Buenos Aires, Argentina: Paidós.
- Rosa Rivero, A. (2004). Memoria, historia e identidad. Una reflexión sobre el papel de la enseñanza de la historia en el desarrollo de la ciudadanía. [Memory, history and identity. A reflection on the role of history education in the development of citizenship.] In M. Carretero & J. F. Voss (Eds.), *Aprender y pensar la historia* (pp. 47-69). Buenos Aires, Argentina: Amorrortu editores.
- Rosa, A. & Blanco, F. (2007). Actuations of Identification in the games of identity. *Social practice/Psychological Theorizing*. <http://www.sppt-gulcerce.boun.edu.tr/article7.aspx>
- Roshwald, A. (2006). *The Endurance of Nationalism: Ancient Roots and Modern Dilemmas*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Rüsen, J. (2004). Historical consciousness: Narrative structure, moral function, and ontogenetic development. In P. Seixas (Ed.), *Theorizing historical consciousness* (pp. 63-85). Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Seixas, P. (1994). Students' understanding of historical significance. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 22, 281-304.

- Seixas, P. (2012). National history and beyond. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 41(6), 719–722.
- Seixas, P. (2012b). Indigenous historical consciousness: An oxymoron or a dialogue? In M. Carretero, M. Asensio & M. Rodriguez-Moneo (Eds.), *History education and the construction of national identities* (pp. 125-138). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Seixas, P. (Ed.) (2004). *Theorizing historical consciousness*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Seixas, P. & Clark, P. (2004). Murals as monuments: Students' ideas about depictions of civilization in British Columbia. *American Journal of Education*, 110, 146–171.
- Seton-Watson, H. (1977). *Nations and states. An enquiry into the origins of nations and the politics of nationalism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Siegel, S. & Castellan, N. J. (1988). *Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Shumway, N. (1991). *The invention of Argentina*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Smith, A. D. (1991). *National identity*. London, UK: Penguin.
- Smith, A. D. (2002). Dating the nation. In D. Conversi (Ed.), *Ethnonationalism and the contemporary world: Walker Connor and the study of nationalism* (pp. 53–71). London, UK: Routledge.
- Snyder, T. (2012). *Bloodlands: Europe Between Hitler and Stalin*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Straub, J. (Ed.) (2005). *Narration, identity and historical consciousness*. New York, NY: Berghahn Books.
- Symcox, L. & Wilschut, A. (Eds.) (2009). *The problem of the canon and the future of history teaching*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup relations. In S. Worchel & W.G. Austin (Eds.), *The Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (2nd edn.) (pp. 7-24). Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.
- Todorov, T. (1997). *The conquest of America*. New York, NY: Harper & Collins.
- Topolsky, J. (2000). The structure of historical narratives and the teaching of history. In J. F. Voss & M. Carretero (Eds.), *Learning and reasoning in history* (pp. 9–23). London, UK: Routledge.
- Tulving, E. & Craik, F. I. M. (Eds.) (2000). *The Oxford Handbook of Memory*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D. & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Tutiaux-Guillon, N. (2012). A traditional frame for global history: The narrative of modernity in French secondary school. In M. Carretero, M. Asensio & M. Rodriguez-Moneo (Eds.), *History education and the construction of national identities* (pp. 109-123). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- van Alphen, F. (2012) Identities: Never the Same Again? *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, 46, 296-302. doi: 10.1007/s12124-012-9201-3

- van Alphen, F. & Asensio, M. (2012). The complex construction of identity representations and the future of history education. In M. Carretero, M. Asensio & M. Rodriguez-Moneo (Eds.), *History education and the construction of national identities* (pp. 311-326). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- van Alphen, F. & Carretero, M. (Accepted). The construction of the relation between national past and present in the appropriation of historical master narratives, *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*. doi: 10.1007/s12124-015-9302-x
- van der Leeuw-Roord, J. (Ed.) (2004). *History changes: Facts and figures about history education in Europe since 1989*. The Hague, The Netherlands: EUROCLIO.
- van der Leeuw-Roord, J. (2007). Two Steps Forward, One Step Back: Shoring Our Stories and Looking for the Common Threads. In D. Smart (Ed.), *Making a Difference: Fifteen years of EUROCLIO* (pp. 66-73). The Hague, The Netherlands: EUROCLIO.
- van Drie, J. & van Boxtel, C. (2004). Enhancing collaborative historical reasoning by providing representational guidance. *International Journal of Historical Learning, Teaching and Research*, 4(2).
- van Drie, J. & van Boxtel, C. (2008). Historical reasoning: towards a framework for analyzing students' reasoning about the past. *Educational Psychology Review*, 20, 87-110. doi: 10.1007/s10648-007-9056-1
- VanSledright, B. (2008). Narratives of nation-state, historical knowledge and school history education. *Review of Research in Education*, 32(1), 109-146.
- Valsiner, J. (2012). Monuments in our minds: Historical symbols as cultural tools. In M. Carretero, M. Asensio & M. Rodriguez-Moneo (Eds.), *History education and the construction of national identities* (pp. 327-345). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Voss, J. F. & Carretero, M. (Eds.) (2000). *Learning and reasoning in history*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Wertsch, J. (1998). *Mind as action*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Wertsch, J. (2002). *Voices of collective remembering*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Wertsch, J. (2004). Specific narratives and schematic narrative templates. In P. Seixas (Ed.), *Theorizing historical consciousness* (pp. 49-62). Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Wertsch, J. V. & Roediger, H. L. (2008). Collective memory: Conceptual foundations and theoretical approaches, *Memory*, 16(3), 318-326.
- Wertsch, J. & Rozin, M. (2000). The Russian Revolution: Official and Unofficial Accounts. In J.F. Voss & M. Carretero (Eds.), *Learning and Reasoning in History* (pp. 39-60). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Westheimer, J. (2007). Pledging allegiance: The politics of patriotism in America's schools. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Wineburg, S. S. (1991). Historical problem solving: A study of the cognitive processes used in the evaluation of documentary and pictorial evidence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 83, 73-87.

Wineburg, S. (2001). *Historical thinking and other unnatural acts*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Wineburg, S., Mosborg, S., Porat, D. & Duncan, A. (2007). Common belief and the cultural curriculum: An intergenerational study of historical consciousness. *American Education Research Journal*, 44, 40–76.

White, H. (1987). *The content of the form: Narrative discourse and historical representation*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.

Yourcenar, M. (2000). *Memoirs of Hadrian*. London, UK: Penguin Books.

Young, R. J. C. (2001). *Postcolonialism: An historical introduction*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.